



88th Meeting of the Bureau of the IUCN Council

By conference call on 9 September 2020 at 9.00 AM UTC

Draft Agenda

Origin: Secretary to Council

09:00-09:05	Agenda Item 1: The President's opening remarks and approval of the Agenda
09:05-09:30	Agenda Item 2: Selection of the members of the Council Working Group to design and guide engagement with IUCN members on the impacts of Covid-19 pandemic <i>On 24 July 2020, the Bureau (87th Meeting) approved the Terms of Reference of the Council Working Group (decision B87/2). According to these Terms of Reference, the Bureau will decide on the membership of the Working Group based on expressions of interest from Council members and nominations received from the Global Group for the development of National and Regional Committees.</i>
09:30-11:00	Agenda Item 3: Recommendation of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) regarding the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 As per the Bureau's advice to the Chair of CPC ¹ , the Bureau will examine the recommendation of the CPC approved at its 8 th meeting on 1 September 2020, and make any recommendation or proposal to Council that it considers appropriate. As the consideration of this matter impacts the relationship to local authorities in the Host Country, sponsors, exhibitors, and suppliers, all members of Council are asked to treat this matter confidentially until the agreed date of an official announcement of the Council decision. <u>Document:</u> B88/3/1 - 8th CPC Meeting - 1 September 2020 - Report to Council - with Annex 1
11:00-11:30	Agenda Item 4: Applications for IUCN membership The President initiated the Bureau's approval process of membership applications by email on 5 September 2020. A member of the Bureau requested to discuss during the Bureau meeting the issues that have been raised by Council members regarding at least two applications. <u>Document:</u> B88/4/1 IUCN membership applications - President to Bureau 05Sep2020 with attachments

¹ "The Chair of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) requested clarification whether the analysis and recommendations of alternative options for holding the Congress fall within the ToR of the CPC. The President summarized the discussion of the Bureau by explaining that the CPC should not feel restricted by its ToR to study any and all aspects of the Congress and transmit its recommendations to Bureau which will discuss them thoroughly before forwarding its proposal(s) to Council." ([Summary of the 87th Bureau meeting, 24 July 2020](#))

Timetable 88th Bureau meeting on Wednesday 9 September 2020 at 9.00 AM UTC

Location	Local Time	Time Zone	UTC Offset
Rarotonga (Cook Islands)	Tuesday, 8 September 2020, 23:00:00	CKT	UTC-10 hours
La Paz (Bolivia)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 05:00:00	BOT	UTC-4 hours
New York (USA - New York)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 05:00:00	EDT	UTC-4 hours
Brasilia (Brazil - Distrito Federal)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 06:00:00	BRT	UTC-3 hours
Dakar (Senegal)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 09:00:00	GMT	UTC
Geneva (Switzerland - Geneva)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 11:00:00	CEST	UTC+2 hours
Harare (Zimbabwe)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 11:00:00	CAT	UTC+2 hours
Stockholm (Sweden)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 11:00:00	CEST	UTC+2 hours
Ramallah (Palestinian Territories - West Bank)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 12:00:00	EEST	UTC+3 hours
Colombo (Sri Lanka)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 14:30:00	IST	UTC+5:30 hours
Beijing (China - Beijing Municipality)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 17:00:00	CST	UTC+8 hours
Corresponding UTC (GMT)	Wednesday, 9 September 2020, 09:00:00		



8th Meeting of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC)
(1 September 2020)

Report

Participants:

CPC: Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere (Chair), Malik Amin Aslam Khan, Andrew Bignell, Mamadou Diallo, Hilde Eggermont, Francesco Gaeta (Host Country), Sixto Incháustegui, Ali Kaka, Kathy MacKinnon, John Robinson, Yann Wehrling (Host Country), Nihal Welikala.

Regrets: Ana Tira (proxy given to Andrew Bignell)

Invited: President Xinsheng Zhang

Host Country observers: Beatrice Galin, Marc Strauss

Secretariat: Bruno Oberle (Director General), Luc Bas, Mylene Chichignoud, Mike Davis, Luc De Wever, Sandrine Friedli-Cela, Tea García-Huidobro, Pamela Grasemann, Enrique Lahmann, Marc Magaud, Sabrina Nick, Cyrie Sendashonga, Ricardo Tejada

Report

The Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) had only one agenda item for its 8th meeting: the Congress scenarios presented by the Secretariat in view of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Options considered

The Committee considered the options analysed by the Secretariat ([Annex 1](#)) and weighed the pros and cons of each.

1. OPTION 1: Maintain Congress at dates set (07 to 15 January 2021)
2. OPTION 2: Postpone Congress entirely
3. OPTION 3: Nature on how the Congress is conducted is changed considerably
4. OPTION 4: Physical Congress is cancelled; Statutory decisions taken by e-vote
5. OPTION 5: A two-pronged approach to Congress (Secretariat's proposal)

The Committee agreed that it was important to take a decision soon to give planning security to Members and all Congress stakeholders and to avoid increasing the financial liability for IUCN.

Recognising that the COVID-19 pandemic continues to adversely impact on nations across the world and that there is uncertainty about its trajectory makes it more and more likely that a large number of Members, stakeholders and participants most likely would not be able to travel to Marseille in early 2021, the CPC concurred that maintaining the IUCN Congress at the currently set dates in January 2021 is no longer a viable option and that a virtual event was very difficult to implement with Members around the world (IUCN Members are distributed in 22 different time zones).

One Committee member was of the opinion that Option 4 was the preferable option given that the uncertainties around COVID-19 could be present for a long time and place Members, particularly from the Pacific islands where many are COVID-19 free, at increased risk. The rest of the Committee members concurred that under the current circumstances postponing is the best way forward, but rather than postponing the full event which could paralyse the Union, it was preferable to pursue *option 5: a two pronged approach to Congress*. This option foresees:

- The postponement of some aspects of Congress including parts of the Members Assembly, Forum, exhibition and Espace Générations Nature to a later date in 2021. This date should be identified in coordination with the Host Country, taking into account the international sequence with other biodiversity events like the CBD COP15, as well as the current contractual arrangements IUCN and the host country have related to the January 2021 dates.
- The holding of an electronic vote at the beginning of 2021 to address the statutory functions of Congress normally addressed in the Members' Assembly, that are necessary to enable IUCN to continue operating smoothly and other decisions are approved during a shorter Members' Assembly (2-3 days) held in conjunction with the Forum and Exhibition at the new Congress dates set (thus allowing the overall shortening of the Congress from 9 to 7-8 days which reduces the costs for IUCN, the Host Country and participants).
- The e-vote scheduled for 7-21 October 2020 on the motions referred to e-vote by the MWG is maintained with the additional question whether they can become effective immediately, by exception to Rule 62septimo.
- A series of virtual sessions that could be organized between January 2021 and some weeks prior to the Congress on topics linked to the Forum, to maintain momentum between now and the actual Congress, provided that extra funding can be secured to finance such sessions.
- That the summits are postponed to the new Congress dates would have to be confirmed with the summit organisers. Note: the One Planet Summit (OPS) is likely to be maintained in January 2021, but the OPS could kick-start a number of initiatives which could be further expanded at the Congress.

The CPC noted that the Host Country currently had not yet finalised a formal political position on the options presented and that while they had tentatively identified two potential dates for a postponed Congress, it would be important for France to align any postponement with the larger international agenda and specifically the CBD COP15 in order to guarantee maximum political impact and international participation at the Congress. France suggested that the date of a postponed Congress should only be chosen once that sequence has been clarified. The CPC understood that, but expressed a clear preference to choose a date towards the later part of 2021 rather than in the first half of 2021 to maximise the chances that the pandemic situation would have improved by then. The Host Country also expressed the view that only essential aspects of Congress should be dealt with electronically and that those items requiring discussion should be included in the physical event.

The CPC's conclusion was to recommend to Council to approve option 5: a two pronged approach to Congress.

Recommendation on which decisions to refer to an electronic vote

The CPC considered which matters normally addressed in the Members' Assembly. The Legal Advisor noted that Council could take this decision in accordance with Articles 48 of the Statutes. The CPC concurred that the current pandemic does represent such extraordinary circumstance. As per Article 94 of the Statutes and Regulation 94, part or all the decisions can be referred to an electronic vote (e-vote) for a decision. This e-vote would be preceded by an online discussion of the proposals to be voted on.

The Legal Adviser distinguished such e-vote from a virtual Assembly^[1]. However, as stated by the Legal Advisor, if all key decisions were referred to an electronic vote, the Assembly meeting would be considered as being replaced by an e-vote. In this case, a physical meeting taking place at a later stage would be considered, formally speaking, as an extraordinary session of the World Congress. Council can take this decision based on article 48 of the Statutes which, in exceptional circumstances, allows Council to take measures that by Statute are prerogatives of the Congress.

The Secretariat clarified that the process for an e-vote would take at least 16 weeks including an online discussion thus making an electronic vote for late January, or perhaps more likely in February 2021 possible. The original dates of Congress would not be able to be used for the e-vote because of the specific procedure laid out in Regulation 94. The technology and process to handle the e-votes exists already and can be used for this and it will be possible to organise an online discussion ahead of these electronic votes.

There were different opinions in the Committee about which Congress agenda items should be referred to an e-vote and which one to the physical Congress. Some members felt that it was important to conclude all Members' Assembly business as quickly as possible by referring all decisions to an e-vote, as a further postponement of statutory decisions was difficult to justify despite the extraordinary circumstances and expressed concern that the onsite participation might still be lower than usual in the 2nd half of 2021. Other members were of the opinion that only the absolutely critical decisions enabling IUCN to operate smoothly should be referred to an e-vote in early 2021, thus allowing IUCN Members to discuss remaining IUCN business in person and to ensure smooth transition in IUCN governance.

It was noted that the e-vote of 7-21 October 2020 on the motions referred to it by the MWG will be maintained as planned and was not affected by the decision on the Congress itself. An additional question would be asked to Members so that the motions could become effective immediately, by exception to Rule 62septimo.

CPC concluded to make the following set of recommendations regarding the Members' Assembly divided in three different categories:

i. Decisions for which CPC recommends that Council to refer to an e-vote at the beginning of 2021:

- a. IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and Financial Plan
- b. Membership Dues Guide
- c. Members' Rescission list
- d. Appointment of External Auditors
- e. Approval of the Financial Statements 2016 to 2019
- f. [The motions to amend the Statutes and other governance issues proposed by Council](#)
- g. Commission mandates

ii. Decisions or agenda items which CPC by consensus recommends Council to refer to the physical Assembly meeting:

- a. Motions on new and urgent topics (Rule 52)
- b. IUCN Medals and Awards
- c. Issues of strategic importance for the Union

^[1] A virtual meeting would imply an opening and closing session of the Member's Assembly, live debates on the different topics referred to in the adopted agenda and the establishment of minutes of the Assembly giving an account of the proceedings and debates (as per Rule 85).

The CPC noted that the Statutes clearly link the formal requirements for the submission of motions on new and urgent topics to the opening of the Member's Assembly¹ and that referring these to an electronic vote would require Council to develop an entirely new process that is not foreseen in the Statutes and not endorsed by IUCN Members.

For the IUCN Medals and Awards as well as honorary memberships, CPC highlighted that a physical meeting is much more conducive to highlight the ceremonial aspects of the matter.

The strategic discussions which are not an item for vote should also be maintained for the physical meeting. Further, it was noted that the GCC had recommended that questions related to the strategic review agreed to in the Management Response to the External Review of IUCN's Governance be addressed at Congress.

iii. Decisions for which CPC does not make a recommendation but leaves the discussion and decision to the full Council:

There were divergent views whether to refer the following items to the e-vote or to the physical Members' Assembly, with a slight majority leaning towards referral to e-vote but the conclusion of the CPC was that the decision should be taken by Council after its recommendations have been considered by the Bureau²:

- a) The 18 motions which the Motions Working Group ([see its 2nd update of 1 September 2020](#)) has referred to the Congress for continued debate and vote (either because they warrant debate at the global level during the Congress or because they are so controversial that it was not possible during the online discussion to produce a consensus text for submission to the electronic vote on motions);
- b) Elections for President, Treasurer, Regional Councillors and Commission Chairs;
- c) Reports from the President/Council, Director General, Treasurer, Commissions, and the National and Regional Committees.

For the 18 motions that have been referred to the Congress by the MWG, the CPC stated that the opinion of the Motions Working Group should be considered by Council to determine whether a second round of online discussions could lead to these motions being ready for referral to an e-vote, in particular the motions on which it was not possible to produce a consensus text during the online discussion of December 2019-March 2020 or on the contrary, if it is already clear that a face-to-face discussion is required.

For the elections, seven members of CPC were in favour of having the elections held by e-vote. The arguments in favour of the e-vote were:

- Elections via e-vote can happen in a democratic way as candidate pages have been and will remain available on the Congress website for several months, allowing Members also to engage with the candidates.

¹ As per Rule 53, new and urgent motions "shall be submitted from one week prior to the opening of the Congress until the end of the plenary sittings on the first day of the Members' Assembly".

² Extract from the summary of the 87th Bureau meeting, 24 July 2020: *Agenda Item 5: Process to discuss the different options of holding the Congress*

"The Chair of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) requested clarification whether the analysis and recommendations of alternative options for holding the Congress fall within the ToR of the CPC. The President summarized the discussion of the Bureau by explaining that the CPC should not feel restricted by its ToR to study any and all aspects of the Congress and transmit its recommendations to Bureau which will discuss them thoroughly before forwarding its proposal(s) to Council."

- Opportunity for virtual candidate presentations and debates is feasible between now and the date of the e-elections. However, some members raised concern about the ability of all members to participate in such virtual presentations due to internet challenges.
- All Members will be able to cast their vote during a period of two weeks thus allowing all Members with voting rights to participate. IUCN has had successful experience in e-votes and the system is 100% reliable.
- Should the pandemic continue into 2021, participation at a physical event by Members from certain regions might be reduced and asking them to give a proxy to Members present is less democratic than enabling them to cast their vote electronically; secondly if the pandemic made a physical Congress impossible in 2021, an e-vote would be required anyway.
- It was not appropriate for Council to extend its term of office.

The arguments in favour of postponing the elections to the physical Assembly meeting, highlighted the following arguments:

- Elections require the opportunity for face-to-face interactions with Members, importantly not all members would have adequate access to internet to be able to participate in virtual presentations.
- Elections before Congress would mean a change in governance bodies before the Congress cycle is concluded resulting in modified composition of the Congress Preparatory Committee with members that do not have the history of the full process and also Council not completely familiar with the governance and statutory reforms posed by the 2016-2020 Council.
- The Statutes provide for Council to hold its term of office from one Congress to the next.

In relation to the reports, the CPC concluded that the decision is linked to the decision on the elections as the reports should be considered electronically if the elections happen through an e-vote and should be considered at the physical Assembly meeting if the elections take place then.

Recommendation on further postponements/no-go criteria

The CPC also noted that the two pronged approach to Congress still had an inherent level of risk as the future evolution of the pandemic is uncertain. The postponement in itself represents increased costs of CHF 100k for each additional month of postponement for staff plus extra costs for suppliers (not quantifiable at this stage). Council therefore should clearly establish that this postponement would not be reconsidered a third time and define a cut-off date, by when a decision would be taken on whether it would be viable to maintain the Congress to minimise the loss that IUCN could incur in case of cancellation following the postponement.

In case of such a cancellation, all remaining statutory business would have to be conducted via e-vote.

The CPC asked the Secretariat to study whether it would be feasible from an operational and financial standpoint to replace the physical meeting with a virtual Forum so that CPC and Council can determine whether such a fall-back option could be considered at the cut-off date. The Secretariat was asked to undertake this analysis and to refine the criteria to be used for a decision at the cut-off date and to report back to the Committee on these two matters. The Secretariat explained that the preparation of a virtual fall-back option would require substantive time and resources and such decision could therefore not wait until the beginning of 2021.

Further process for taking the decision

The CPC discussed the next steps for the decision-taking and a few members suggested that the CPC recommendation should go directly to the Council and not the Bureau. The Chair of CPC explained that she had raised the question in the Bureau on 24 July 2020 whether the Terms of Reference of the CPC included issues like postponement and alternative formats of Congress. The Bureau's advice was that the CPC should not feel restricted by its mandate to study any and all aspects of the Congress, but that it should make recommendations to the Bureau for further deliberation.³ Vice President John Robinson noted that the Bureau had not relinquished its role in discussing the recommendations of the CPC. The CPC acknowledged the role of the Bureau and asked the Chair to recommend to the Bureau to forward the CPC report and recommendation to Council for consideration during its 100th meeting on 14 September 2020. The CPC further acknowledged that it would be the President's prerogative to determine whether he would like to discuss the CPC recommendation at the Bureau prior to referring it to Council. In that case, the Bureau meeting would have to be convened ahead of the 100th Council meeting. The Legal Adviser clarified, that Council could decide on the matter, even if the Bureau meeting was not held.

Decision

The Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC),

Having examined the analysis and recommendations presented by the Secretariat on available options in case the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 could not be held in January 2021 as planned (Annex 1),

Taking into account the preliminary results of consultations with the Host Country, which has not taken any decision at this stage, and

Mindful of advice from the Bureau of the IUCN Council (87th meeting) that it would welcome the recommendations of the CPC on alternative options for holding the Congress,

Recommends the Bureau to forward the following recommendations of the CPC to the IUCN Council in time for consideration and decision at its 100th meeting on 14 September 2020:

1. The IUCN Council, based on Article 48 of the Statutes, in light of the exceptional circumstance that as a result of the pandemic caused by Covid-19, it cannot be guaranteed that the all IUCN Members and Congress participants will be able to travel to Marseille in January 2021 and meet in all safety, adopts a “two pronged approach to Congress” by which:
 - A. the Congress, and more specifically, agreed aspects of the Members Assembly, the Forum, and the exhibition, is postponed to a later date in 2021, to be mutually agreed with the Host Country taking into account the calendar of international biodiversity / environmental meetings, particularly the CBD COP15, and the importance of ensuring a wide local, national and international mobilisation at a time it can be considered possible and safe for all IUCN Members and partners to travel to Marseille, and that such date should be identified as soon as practically possible in the weeks following this decision, and

³ Extract from the summary of the 87th Bureau meeting, 24 July 2020: *Agenda Item 5: Process to discuss the different options of holding the Congress*

“The Chair of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) requested clarification whether the analysis and recommendations of alternative options for holding the Congress fall within the ToR of the CPC. The President summarized the discussion of the Bureau by explaining that the CPC should not feel restricted by its ToR to study any and all aspects of the Congress and transmit its recommendations to Bureau which will discuss them thoroughly before forwarding its proposal(s) to Council.”

- B. the following items included for decision in the Draft Congress Agenda are referred to an electronic vote of IUCN Members to be held in January/ February 2021 in accordance with Article 94 of the Statutes and Article 94 of the Regulations, in order to ensure the smooth functioning of IUCN, while all remaining matters are maintained on the draft Agenda of the Members' Assembly as postponed to the new dates determined in accordance with paragraph 1 (A) of the present decision:
- i. IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and Financial Plan
 - ii. Dues Guide 2022-24
 - iii. Members' Rescission list
 - iv. Appointment of External Auditors
 - v. Financial Statements 2016 to 2019
 - vi. [The motions to amend the Statutes and other governance issues proposed by Council](#)
 - vii. Mandates of the IUCN Commissions.
- C. As a result of submitting a number of decision items to the electronic vote as per paragraph 1 (B) of the present decision, the Council decides to reduce the length of the (physical) Members' Assembly session to xxx days and modifies the draft Congress Agenda accordingly.
- D. a series of virtual sessions should be organised between January 2021 and some weeks prior to the Congress on topics linked to the Forum in order to maintain the momentum amongst Members and other stakeholders, provided additional funding from sponsors and donors can be secured to cover the costs for organising and holding these virtual sessions.
- E. Links shall be created and maintained with the One Planet Summit in case it is decided by the Host Country to hold that Summit prior to the Congress thus allowing the Congress to build and enhance the momentum for biodiversity launched at that Summit.
2. The IUCN Council is invited to consider whether any of the following matters should be added to the list in paragraph 1 (B) for submission to the electronic vote or whether they should remain on the draft Agenda of the Members' Assembly as postponed to the new dates determined in accordance with paragraph 1 (A) of the present decision:
- i. The motions which the Motions Working Group ([see its 2nd update of 1 September 2020](#)) has referred to the Congress for continued debate and vote (either because they warrant debate at the global level during the Congress or because they are so controversial that it was not possible during the online discussion to produce a consensus text for submission to the electronic vote on motions);
 - ii. Elections for President, Treasurer, Regional Councillors and Commission Chairs;
 - iii. Reports from the President/Council, Director General, Treasurer, Commissions, and the National and Regional Committees.
3. The IUCN Council decides that no further postponement beyond the new dates to be determined in accordance with paragraph 1 (A) shall be considered and requests the Secretariat to present to CPC in time for Council's consideration at its 101st meeting:
- A. a set of possible criteria enabling Council to decide at the latest four months prior to the new dates whether or not to hold the Congress on the new dates determined in accordance with paragraph 1 (A) of the present decision; and
 - B. its assessment of the feasibility and cost of preparing and holding the Forum and Exhibition by virtual means in case they cannot be held on the new dates determined in accordance with paragraph 1 (A) of the present decision and have to be cancelled to allow Council to decide on whether this option should be a back-up plan for a possible cancellation necessary under 3 (A).



Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

29 August 2020

Background

In light of the ongoing and deteriorating COVID-19 pandemic, it is necessary to reconsider options for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020. The Secretariat has analysed the feasibility, advantages and disadvantages/risks of all options in this paper and makes a recommendation to CPC and Council on which option to pursue.

It must be noted that every option presented has a number of risks and uncertainties that are very difficult to assess and quantify with the uncertainty on the likely evolution of the pandemic and resulting impacts on the global economy. All options will result in a financial deficit for IUCN but financial impacts are not the only criteria to take into account when taking a decision on Congress, the highest decision-body of the Union.

There is increasing pressure for a signal to be given with regards to the Congress. In order to limit the financial liabilities for IUCN but also for the Host Country and participants, a decision on the Congress needs to be taken by Council as soon as possible. The French Government expects this decision to be taken by mid-September 2020.

It is important to note that the CBD will postpone its COP15 and is seemingly considering September /October 2020, having recently announced that its main preparatory meetings, the SBSTTA and SBI, will take place physically in the first quarter of 2021, instead of November 2020. They are currently considering options for carrying out virtual discussions on the dates that had been set for November.

Process

The following process is being followed for coming to a decision:

Deadline	Action
21 August 2020	First draft of Secretariat recommendation paper
24-25 August 2020	DG Meetings in Paris with M. Strauss and organisers of One Planet Summit
26 August	2 nd draft of the Secretariat recommendation paper to be shared with CPC Chair and IUCN President as well as Host Country
28 August	Call between President, CPC Chair, DG, Congress Director and Congress Manager
29 August	CPC Decision paper and Secretariat recommendation paper circulated to CPC
1 September 2020, 12 :00 – 14 :00	CPC considers the options presented in this paper and makes initial recommendation to Council or Bureau
07 September 2020	Host Country consults with the French Presidency (Elysée) and decision-makers at local level on the preferred option
08 September 2020	French Minister of Environment Barbara Pompili and IUCN Director General discuss options
10 September 2020	Bureau or CPC considers final options and makes final recommendation to Council

Commented [EL1]: To be decided by the President

Commented [EL2]: To be decided by the President

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

14 September 2020	Council reviews recommendation and takes a decision
16 September 2020	IUCN and Host Country Communications team prepare official announcement and special announcement to stakeholders
15 September	Minister informs Mayor of Marseille as well as President of Region/Department of the joint IUCN-MTE decision
15 or 16 September 2020 (TBC)	Local Steering Committee meeting (COPIL) in Marseille: Deputy Environment Minister for Biodiversity Bérangère Abba and IUCN Director General announce decision to the local Steering Committee
COPIL date, time	Announcement to IUCN staff and Congress stakeholders (exhibitors, sponsors, session organisers, etc.)
COPIL date, time+2h	Official announcement of decision

Commented [PG3]: To adjust as per date of local steering committee

Commented [PG4]: To be confirmed with MTE whether to keep this step

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Options

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
1. Congress is maintained for January 2021	Congress will be held as currently planned: a mainly physical event with remote-access provided to key sessions (Congress Opening, Forum high-level sessions, MA opening, etc.) and fully virtual Speaker pitches	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No need to change plans for Congress or renegotiate hotels and accommodation. No new costs related to deferral or cancellation Maintaining the momentum "2021 year of biodiversity". Ability to maintain most events of the Congress, including options for remote access Secretariat enabled to focus attention again on Programme delivery/project implementation soon in 2021 	<p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard logistical challenges; need to prepare/adjust sanitary measures in accordance with local requirements as per the evolving pandemic situation Increased costs of the Congress due to health and security measures to be put in place Congress would take place a very long time before the CBD COP thus making it difficult to influence the decisions at the CBD COP Health and security risks for staff and participants remain high, even with IUCN taking appropriate measures to mitigate such risks. Incurring expenses that cannot be reimbursed (e.g. tickets/staff hotels, sponsored delegates, international speakers who will not be able to travel in the end); Risks associated with persistence of the pandemic: Lower participation due to widespread travel restrictions leads to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - skewed geographical representation (very European Congress) To mitigate this risk, Members unable to attend may be encouraged to give a proxy to Members present at 	<p>In this option, it would be necessary to agree with the French Govt on criteria, and a date, for a final go/no-go decision (i.e. to decide when, and by what criteria, would a decision be triggered on the cancellation of the Congress).</p> <p>Given the risks of this Option, the <i>per capita costs of the Congress could be very high (potentially disproportional)</i> compared to the actual number of participants (as a</p>

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
			<p><i>Congress, while Members also have the possibility to request that decisions be confirmed by e-vote under the conditions provided in Article 36 of the Statutes.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cancellation of sessions because session organiser cannot travel leading to empty rooms - Low attendance by school children from France (EGN) - Withdrawal of high-level speakers and guests as well as exhibitors. Note: Withdrawal already announced by UNDP, SFI, Rare. - Low attendance by international audiences leads to lower registration income, and empty rooms - Significant financial loss as a result of low attendance, cancellation by exhibitors and sunk costs. Cancellation closer to the time of the event could result in losses for IUCN up to CHF 5m. <p>Reputational risk to IUCN and the Host country by maintaining the Congress in January 2021 despite the current pandemic situation.</p> <p>The cancellation of Congress closer to the date (due to a prohibition by national authorities) remains a high risk and would result in higher financial costs than those incurred already, and would also carry political and reputational costs.</p> <p>Liability for IUCN if the health and security of staff and participants cannot be guaranteed or the Congress becomes a source of increased infection. This could lead to bad press, and a risk of closure of Congress which would leave IUCN with</p>	result of empty rooms, empty exhibit hall, food waste, etc.) and there are a number of reputational, political and financial costs associated with this option.

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
			<p>statutory obligations not respected and strong dissatisfaction of participants.</p> <p>Logistical difficulties could augment further, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delays during the set-up period in case of contamination with COVID-19 even off site - Delivery of materials may be problematic if production in certain countries has to stop or shipping is prohibited (i.e. voting machines for Members' Assembly). - IUCN staff not able or not willing to travel to the Congress, causing last minute replacement problems. - Quarantine is imposed by some countries before staff or participants can return from France → increased costs for IUCN to cover staff and Sponsored Delegates for staying extra time in France. 	
2. Congress is postponed	The Congress in full is postponed to a later date in 2021 (most likely between May and September)	<p>Pros:</p> <p>Changes to project are moderate: mostly maintaining current plan with return to original project for outside areas</p> <p>Maintaining the "2021 year of biodiversity" momentum</p>	<p>Cons:</p> <p>Vacuum or delay in the governance decision process paralyzes the organisation. Statutory requirements would not be met and 2021 operations would be greatly hindered, especially if a later date is chosen (in particular for decisions on IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and Financial Plan; Members' Rescission list; Appointment of External Auditors; Membership Dues Guide 2022-24 and on the Financial Statements 2016 to 2019); (Note: Option 5 takes this into account).</p> <p>Financial and contractual issues: There would be loss of certain expenses incurred (deposits for accommodation, non-reusable</p>	<p>This option would lead to a shortened preparation cycle for the 2024 Congress and a shorter term of office for the 2021-24 Council unless the cycle is modified and the</p>

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
		<p>Potential additional participants from tourists in addition to locals</p> <p>If pandemic situation improves by then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More representative global participation --> higher registration fee income - Fewer cancellations by exhibitors <p>Choosing a later date could lower the risk of a definitive cancellation</p>	<p>services of contract holders). Renegotiation and amendments of all contracts related to Congress organization would also be needed.</p> <p>Increase in costs due to the further postponement of Congress as, among others, staff recruited (Congress Team) will need to remain engaged without any certainty that the costs will be recovered or that the Congress will go ahead. Postponement adds costs of CHF 100k a month. Therefore the maximum loss that IUCN could incur would be CHF 5m + 100k for each additional month of postponement + costs extra for suppliers (not quantifiable at this stage).</p> <p>Loss of momentum among stakeholders – which could be addressed by organizing a series of virtual sessions prior to Congress</p> <p>Relevance: The content of the Forum would need to be revisited and updated given that the original Call for Proposals went out mid-2019. It would not be possible to do another Call for Proposals.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Potential costs from renegotiation of all contracts and agreements. Indemnification of the venue implies costs for the Host Country.</p>	<p>next Congress held in 2025 or elections are done by e-vote in January as could be decided by Council under the proposal made in option 5.</p> <p>In this option, it would be necessary to agree with the French Govt on criteria, and a date, for a final go/no-go decision (i.e. to decide when, and by what, would a decision be triggered on the cancellation of the Congress).</p> <p>In this option, the risk of ultimate cancellation remains. If</p>

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
			<p>Hotel rooms are not available or charge higher rates at new dates → increased costs</p> <p>Suppliers/hotels may go bankrupt before the new date → increased costs</p> <p>Selected Forum sessions and/or motions may no longer be relevant but without enough time to re-organize a call for proposals/submissions</p> <p>Staff burn-out (staff involved in Congress preparation will have been working in stress mode for two years) and delays in project/Programme implementation would increase as long as staff remain focused on Congress</p>	cancellation is necessary even after a second postponement, the financial losses would be even higher depending on the timing of the decision on cancellation. The reputational and political costs would also be high.
3. Nature of the Congress nature is changed considerably	<p>Congress is changed to an entirely new format requiring several months of re-planning and re-organization (date would have to be moved to second half of 2021);</p> <p>Possible options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fully virtual event requiring rethinking 	<p>Pros</p> <p>No risks beyond the costs incurred which would only be partially offset by lower travel costs (i.e. if decision is to virtualize most parts of the Congress)</p> <p>Viable option independently of the evolution of the pandemic</p>	<p>Cons:</p> <p>Timing issues: Up to a year will be needed to redesign the new format and identify partners/staff with skills to deliver this as IUCN does not have in-house expertise on virtual events and related IT requirements at this stage. (Design phase for new format would take several months before a new concept could be validated by Council).</p> <p>In turn, delaying the governance decision process would generate an operational vacuum that would paralyze the organisation (in particular for decisions on IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and Financial Plan; Members' Rescission list;</p>	<p>This possibility is not expressly foreseen in the Statutes but would be acceptable under the current circumstances.</p>

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
	<p>of length and complexity (Forum, Members' Assembly, Exhibition, EGN)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully virtual Forum with a 1-2 days virtual Members' Assembly; the EGN and exhibition could take place as physical events 	<p>Could be an opportunity to try new creative format that could shape the future of IUCN Congress for 2024 and beyond</p> <p>Builds IUCN's reputation as a more modern institution and addresses criticism regarding environmental impact of such a large event (mainly travel).</p>	<p>Appointment of External Auditors; Membership Dues Guide 2022-24 and on the Financial Statements 2016 to 2019). (Note: option 5 takes this into account).</p> <p>Financial and contractual issues: This option would mean the total loss of all expenses incurred until now without any concrete results nor any possibility of recovery. Estimated cost until mid Sep 2020: CHF 3-3.5m for IUCN. It would also mean increased expenditures linked to staffing costs of CHF 100k per month for the additional time needed to plan and roll out the virtual Congress, plus the technological/consultancy costs to deliver it. There would also be a need for renegotiation, amendments or termination of contracts related to Congress organization</p> <p>Political issues: option least favoured by the Host Country. This option would affect Ministry's and IUCN's political relations with Marseille partners, especially local authorities. The scope of the Hosting Agreement and France's role in the Congress would need to be redefined.</p> <p>Unnecessary mobilisation of stakeholders in France.</p> <p>Impact issues: There is little research/evidence on the benefits of virtual exhibitions at this stage. It may prove difficult or even impossible to maintain the Exhibition and Espace Génération Nature (EGN) in virtual format, and the interest in mobilizing civil society in France around biodiversity issues could be greatly reduced.</p>	<p>It may therefore be advisable to ask prior confirmation of IUCN Members through an e-vote.</p>

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
			<p>Decision could not be reversed even if situation of pandemic improves</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Low attendance/more passive participation in a purely online event, particularly in the Members' Assembly (will need to operate in 22 different time zones). Most probably decision-making/voting will not be possible in real-time</p> <p>Networking at a purely virtual event is very difficult</p> <p>Financial income for IUCN likely severely reduced (significantly lower income from registration and exhibition as fees would have to be lowered). A 50% decline in income would be CHF 3.5m.</p> <p>Might deter future candidate countries from submitting a proposal to host the IUCN World Conservation Congress</p> <p>Staff burn-out (staff involved in Congress preparation will have been working in stress mode for two years) and delays in project/Programme implementation as long as staff remain focused on Congress</p> <p>If the new model includes holding part of the Congress physically, the same risks as in option 2 apply for that segment</p>	

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
4. Physical Congress is cancelled and all statutory decisions are taken by e-vote	<p>The ordinary session of the Word Congress, including the World conservation Forum and the Members' Assembly would be cancelled.</p> <p>Forum, Exhibition, Espace Génération Nature are not replaced;</p> <p>The Members' Assembly is replaced by an e-vote on all the Members' Assembly decisions at beginning of 2021</p>	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional financial losses, although significant, can be contained prior to incurring more expenditures/commitments Health and security for Members, staff and participant is guaranteed Time can be used to redesign 2024 Congress in a new format 	<p>Cons:</p> <p><i>The "2021 year of biodiversity" momentum is lost.</i></p> <p><i>Key moment for gathering the Union is lost</i> (Congress is a key milestone for the entire Membership)</p> <p>Major financial losses for IUCN (all expenditures incurred until now; loss of all income with exception of IUCN own contribution and host country contribution for incurred expenditures (so far statutory translation and CPC meeting). Estimated deficit if Congress cancelled mid-September 2020 is CHF 3-3.5million.</p> <p>Termination of almost all contracts related to Congress organisation</p> <p>Financial losses for Host Country</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Reputational risk</p> <p>Might deter future candidate countries from submitting a proposal to host the IUCN World Conservation Congress</p>	
5. A two-pronged approach to Congress (Secretariat's)	Forum, Exhibition, EGN postponed to a date between May and September in currently envisaged format	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for option 2 plus an e-vote in early 2021 on those issues of the Members' Assembly that 	<p>Cons:</p> <p>Loss of certain expenses incurred (deposits for accommodation, non-reusable services of contract holders)</p>	As per Option 2, the risk of ultimate cancellation remains in this option too. If cancellation is

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
recommendation)	<p>The outside areas will be adjusted to revert to the previous June model;</p> <p>Some if not all decisions of the Members' Assembly are taken via e-vote at the beginning of 2021 and a shorter Assembly is held at the new Congress dates to approve the other decisions</p> <p>A series of virtual sessions in the preparation phase to maintain momentum</p>	<p>Council decides will enable IUCN to minimize the risk that a vacuum or delay in the governance decision process paralyzes the organization.</p> <p>The e-vote in early 2021 might allow shortening of Congress days to 7 (if elections and most decisions done by e-vote) or 8 thus reducing costs for IUCN, Host Country and participants</p>	<p>Renegotiation and amendments of all contracts related to Congress organization</p> <p>Increase in costs due to the further postponement of Congress as, among others, staff recruited will need to remain engaged without any certainty that the costs will be recovered or that the Congress will go ahead. Every month of postponement adds costs of CHF 100k. Therefore the maximum loss that IUCN could incur would be CHF 5m + 100k for each additional month of postponement + costs extra for suppliers (not quantifiable at this stage).</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Potential costs from renegotiation of all contracts and agreements</p> <p>Indemnification of venue (cost for Host Country)</p> <p>Hotel rooms are not available or charge higher rates at new dates → increased costs</p> <p>Suppliers/hotels may go bankrupt before the new date → increased costs</p> <p>Selected Forum sessions and/or motions may no longer be relevant but without enough time to re-organize a call for proposals/submissions</p> <p>Staff burn-out (staff involved in Congress preparation will have been working in stress mode for two years) and delays in</p>	<p>necessary even after a second postponement, the financial losses would be even higher depending on the timing of the decision on cancellation. The reputational and political costs would also be high. In addition, a second round of e-votes would have to take place, if only part of the Member's Assembly's decision are taken via e-vote in January.</p>

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Option	Description	Pros	Cons/risks	Considerations
			project/Programme implementation as long as staff remain focused on Congress	

CONFIDENTIAL

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Secretariat's conclusions and recommendation – Option 5: A two-pronged approach to Congress

Option 1: In the Secretariat's opinion, maintaining the Congress in January 2021 likely means holding a mostly European Congress with minimal impact, likely financial losses, possible health risks for staff and participants, and potentially high political costs to IUCN. This Option is therefore not politically viable.

Option 2: While postponing the Congress is possible, it bears the risk of losing momentum and paralysing the organisation due to the vacuum or delay in the governance decision process. Postponement by itself, without additional measures, is therefore not an option.

Option 3: Radically changing the nature of the Congress will require several months of re-planning and re-organization before a decision on the format could be taken with extra costs and a strongly reduced income while requiring postponing the date. In addition, the Option would have to be organised and financed without the Host Country support and is therefore not desirable.

Option 4: Cancelling the Congress and complying only with statutory requirements would provide certainty with regards to the financial and political implications but would create major financial losses without any positive impacts that were meant to be sought with Congress making this option not viable.

Option 5: The Secretariat proposes Option 5 as the preferable option from the table above: **a two-pronged approach to Congress** which mitigates some of the risks of a sheer postponement. A decision on this option may be announced with or without a new date, as this decision could be taken in two steps whereby Council and the French authorities define the preferred date in a second step, before the end of September 2020.

This **two-pronged approach to Congress** could be as follows:

1. Forum, Exhibition and Espace Génération Nature are postponed to a later date (between May and September 2021) but maintained in their currently planned format; i.e. the changes already applied to the Forum (virtual speaker pitches, remote access for major sessions) will be maintained; the content of the Forum sessions will need to be updated and adjusted to make sure they continue to be relevant; it would not be possible to do another Call for Proposals.
2. It would be possible to use the outside areas in Parc Chanot and revert to the previous June model;
3. The format of the Members' Assembly is adjusted as follows:

Some of the decisions of the Members' Assembly are approved via e-vote at the beginning of 2021 and other decisions are approved during a shorter Members' Assembly (2-3days) held in conjunction with the Forum and Exhibition at the new Congress dates set (thus allowing to shorten the overall length of the Congress from 9 to 7/8 days which reduces the costs for IUCN, the Host Country and participants). The e-vote of 7-21 October 2020 on the motions referred to e-vote by the MWG will be maintained with the additional question whether they can become effective immediately, by exception to Rule 62septimo.

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

The Secretariat recommends that, at minimum, the following decisions are approved via e-vote¹ at the beginning of 2021:

- IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and Financial Plan
- Dues Guide 2022-24
- Members' Rescission list
- Appointment of External Auditors
- Approval of the Financial Statements 2016 to 2019

In line with the above proposal, Council will have to determine which of the remaining decisions listed below could also be taken via e-vote at beginning of 2021 and which should be discussed during a physical Assembly meeting:

- Motions that the MWG has referred to discussion in Congress, plus the Council proposed motions on statutory reform (Rule 45bis (c))
- Motions on new and urgent topics (Rule 52)
- Elections for President, Treasurer, Regional Councillors and Commission Chairs (Note: in case of an e-vote the "online discussion" would mean online "live" candidate presentations and/or debates)
- Commission mandates
- IUCN Medals and Awards

In addition, the reports from President, Director General, Treasurer, Commissions, and the National and Regional Committees, could either be considered in electronic format at the beginning of 2021, or be presented during a physical Assembly meeting. The issues of strategic importance would be discussed at the physical Assembly, including wider issues regarding the state of the Union. Note: Should all decisions be treated at the beginning of 2021, and should it be necessary to subsequently cancel the Congress (i.e. if the pandemic does not improve), the statutory business would already be dealt with, without the need to have a second round of e-votes.

4. In order to maintain momentum between now and the actual Congress, a series of virtual sessions could be organized between January 2021 and some weeks prior to the Congress on topics linked to the Forum. Important: extra funding would be needed to organise/stage these virtual sessions.
5. Summits: to be confirmed with summit organizers whether the summits could/should be postponed to the new Congress dates or held separately i.e. as virtual events leading up to Congress. Note: the One Planet Summit is likely to be maintained in January but the OPS could kick-start a number of initiatives which could be further expanded at the Congress.

The Secretariat sees **option 5** as the most viable, allowing to hold a truly global Congress while not paralyzing the organisation. However, it must be noted that it still has inherent risks that cannot be discarded at this stage given the uncertainties of the pandemic and related evolution of the global economy. The extra costs linked to the postponement and the virtual sessions held prior to Congress would hopefully be balanced by extra income due to more participation and exhibitors but there is no guarantee for this and the organisation needs to accept the inherent financial risk when deciding this option.

¹ **Note:** "e-vote" in this document means: an electronic ballot of the IUCN Members preceded by online discussion of the proposals put to the e-vote in accordance with Regulation 94. In the case of elections held by e-vote, the online discussion would mean online "live" candidate presentations and/or debates.

Annex 1
IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020
Congress scenarios and Secretariat recommendation

Given the uncertainties, the Secretariat also recommends that Council agrees with the French Government on clear criteria and a date at which to decide whether maintaining the Congress is or not viable so that in case of persistence/deterioration of the pandemic, a go/no-go decision can be taken quickly. A third postponement should not be considered. To support this go/no-go decision, the Secretariat would carry out an assessment, preferably no less than 4 months prior to the new Congress dates (before financial liabilities start to increase) reviewing the following to determine whether maintaining the Congress is viable using criteria such as: 1) Is France or Marseille on the list of countries and areas, which Switzerland has declared to be with high infection risk; 2) Is Switzerland on the list of countries and areas declared to be with a high risk of infection by France; 3) Are more than 25% of registered participants residents of countries which are on France's list or which have declared France as a risk country. These criteria will need to be further discussed and confirmed.

CONFIDENTIAL

From: President - IUCN
To: +IUCN BUREAU 2017-2020
Cc: GILMOUR-BIERI Fleurange
Subject: FOR THE IUCN BUREAU'S APPROVAL BY 12 SEPTEMBER 2020 – IUCN membership applications
Date: 05 September 2020 22:20:02
Attachments: [Annex 1 - Membership applications for Bureau's consideration in August 2020.pdf](#)
[Annex 2 - Decision of the Governance and Constituency Committee 26 August 2020.pdf](#)
[image006.png](#)

You are kindly invited to reply to this message by 12 September 2020 with your response to the question whether you approve the draft decision below

Dear members of the Bureau of the IUCN Council,

During its meetings of 4 June and 8 July 2020, the Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) considered a number of applications for IUCN membership and concluded its deliberations with a decision approved by email correspondence on 26 August 2020. The GCC's decision is presented in Annex 2 to which also the minutes of the two GCC meetings are attached.

The GCC recommends the Bureau to accept the admission of 28 new IUCN Members and the rejection of 3 applications.

The names of the applicants recommended for admission and rejection, together with links to more detailed information, are presented in Annex 1.

DRAFT BUREAU DECISION

The Bureau of the IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC),

Approves the admission of 28 organizations and/or institutions applying for IUCN membership in accordance with Regulation 18; (Annex 1)

Rejects the following applications for IUCN membership:

- European Sustainable Use Group, Belgium based on the fact that the organisation in its public documents and statutes falsely represents itself as a part of IUCN;
- New Mexico BioPark Society, USA, based on the fact that this is not a conservation organization but a procurement organization; and
- S.P.E.C.I.E.S. The Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their International Ecological Study, USA, based on the fact that they are not a legal entity;

Takes note of the GCC's decision to defer its consideration of the applications from

- Center for Environmental Ethics and Law, USA,
- Center for Biological Diversity, USA,

- **Beijing Sunny Green Environmental Protection Foundation, China and**
 - **Institute of Constructions and Urban Economics, Viet Nam,**
- to its next meeting.**

You are therefore kindly invited to reply to this message by 12 September 2020 with your response to the question whether you approve the above draft decision.

This message will be sent for information to Council members who are not members of the Bureau, inviting them to share with the Bureau any queries or concerns they may have before 12 September 2020.

Once approved by the Bureau, Council members will receive the Bureau's decision for validation through the no-objection procedure provided by Regulation 58.

With my best wishes,

ZHANG Xinsheng

President

IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)

www.iucn.org

www.iucncongress2020.org



28 Membership applications approved by GCC

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
Africa	1	Plateforme Nationale des Organisations Agro-Sylvo-pastorales et halieutiques du Cameroun (National Platform of Agro-sylvopastoral and fisheries Professional organisations of Cameroun)	PLANOPAC	Cameroun	www.planopac.cm	NG	1) NG/24960 CIPRE, Cameroun 2) NG/25723 Green Connexion, Cameroun	25910
	2	Association Marocaine pour le Développement des Aires Protégées (Moroccan Association for the Development of Protected Areas)	AMDAP	Morocco		NG	1) NG/1163 Association Marocaine pour la Protection de l'Environnement et le Climat, Morocco (Moroccan Association for Environment and Climate Protection) 2) NG/25846 Groupe de Recherche pour la Protection des Oiseaux au Maroc, Morocco (Moroccan Association for Environment and Climate Protection)	AMDAP_inclDDP
Meso and South America	3	Fundación Salvadoreña para la Promoción Social y el Desarrollo Económico (Salvadoran Foundation for Social Promotion and Economic Development)	FUNSALPRO DENSE	El Salvador	www.funsalprodese.org.sv	NG	1) NG/24645, Unidad Ecológica Salvadoreña, Honduras (Salvadorean Ecological Unit) 2) NG/24904 Comité para la Defensa y Desarrollo de la Flora y Fauna del Golfo de Fonseca, Honduras (Committee for the Defense and Development of the Flora and Fauna of the Gulf of Fonseca)	25967
	4	Proyecto Aldea Global (Global Village Project)	PAG	Honduras	www.paghonduras.org	NG	1) IP/24707 Agencia para el Desarrollo de la Mosquitia, Honduras (Agency for the Development of the Honduran Mosquitia) 2) NG/25741 Asociación para el Manejo Integrado de Cuencas de La Paz y Comayagua, Honduras (Association for the Integrated Management of the La Paz and Comayagua Watersheds)	PAG_inclDDP

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
Meso and South America	5	Fundación Nicaragüense para la Conservación- Fundación COCIBOLCA (COCIBOLCA Foundation)	FC	Nicaragua		NG	1) NG/24280 Fundación Reserva Esperanza Verde, Nicaragua 2) NG/24694 Asociación Club de Jóvenes Ambientalistas, Nicaragua (Youth Environmentalists Club)	25968
North America & the Caribbean	6	Canopy Planet Society		Canada	https://canopyplanet.org	NG	1) NG/194 The Nature Conservancy, USA 2) NG/25746 Synchronicity Earth, UK	CANOPY incl DDP
	7	The Wildlife Society	(TWS)	United States of America	www.wildlife.org	NG	1) NG/25729 Wild Sheep Foundation, USA 2) AF/192 National Wildlife Federation, USA	TWS incl DDP
	8	Center for Global Wildlife Conservation from the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry	CGWC	United States of America	www.esf.edu	NG	1) NG/25554 Cornell Botanic Garden, USA 2) NG/25616 Safari Club International Foundation, USA	CGWC inc DDP
	9	Conservation X Labs, Inc.	CXL	United States of America	www.conservationxlabs.org	NG	1) NG/279 Smithsonian Institution, USA 2) NG/25779 Thinking Animals United, Inc., USA	CXL incl DDP
	10	Revive & Restore		United States of America	www.reviverestore.org	NG	1) NG/25746 Synchronicity Earth, UK 2) IN/25310 Island Conservation, USA	RR inclDDP

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
South and East Asia	11	FRIENDSHIP		Bangladesh	www.friendship.ngo	NG	1) NG/25682 Jiban Bikash Karjocrom, Bangladesh 2) NG/ 22337 Center for Natural Resources Studies, Bangladesh	25991
	12	Cloud Mountain Conservation		China	www.cloudmountain.cn	NG	1) NG/25182 Shan Shui Conservation Center, China 2) NG/25765 Yunnan Green Environment Development Foundation, China	25966 Addlinfo
	13	China Environmental Protection Foundation	CEPF	China	http://www.cepf.org.cn/cepf_english/	NG	1) NG/25373 Society of Entrepreneurs & Ecology, China 2) NG/25044 All-China Environment Foundation, China	CEPF Addl info
	14	Green Pine Care Foundation	GPF	China		NG	1) NG/25611 Guangzhou Green City Environmental and Cultural Development Center, China 2) NG/25615 Shenzhen Mangrove Wetlands Conservation Foundation, China	25981
	15	India Water Foundation	IWF	India	www.indiawaterfoundation.org	NG	1) NG/25518 COORG Wildlife Society, India 2) NG/25370 Association for Rural Area Society Modification, Improvement and Nestling, India	25983
	16	Pakistan Rural Initiatives for Emergency Preparedness, Response and Development	PREPARED	Pakistan	www.preparedpakistan.org	NG	1) NG/25340 Human Resource Development Network, Pakistan 2) NG/25352 Institute of Rural Management, Pakistan	25989
	17	Foundation of Environmental Education for Sustainable Development (Thailand)	FEED	Thailand		NG	1) ST/161 Department od National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation, Thailand 2) NG/24714 Thailand Environmental Institute Foundation, Thailand	25965

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
West Asia	18	Centre for Restoration of the Iraqi Marshlands and Wetlands	CRIMW	Iraq	https://crim.mowr.gov.iq	GA	n/a	25919
	19	Nature Iraq Organization	NI	Iraq	www.natureiraq.org	NG	1) IN/213 BirdLife Intl, UK 2) NG/24611 World Land Trust, UK	25920
	20	Jordan BirdWatch Association	JBW	Jordan	www.jordanbirdwatch.com	NG	1) NG/25198 Royal Botanic Garden, Jordan 2) NG/25469 The Environmental Education Center of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land, Palestine	JBW_incl DDP
Oceania	21	The Colong Foundation for Wilderness	CFW	Australia	www.colongwilderness.org.au	NG	1) NG/270 Autralian Conservation Foundation, Australia 2) NG/518 Nature Conservation Council	CFW_incl DDP
East Europe, North and Central Asia	22	Udruga Dinarica (Dinarica Association)		Bosnia and Herzegovina		NG	1) NG/409 WWF, Switzerland 2) NG/487 WWF, The Netherlands	25929
	23	The Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus	RECC	Georgia	www.rec-caucasus.org	NG	1) NG/25062 Field researchers` Union - CAMPESTER, Georgia 2) ST/25100 Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	25923
	24	Lovacki savez Srbije (Hunting Association of Serbia)	LSS	Serbia	http://www.lss.rs/	NG	1) IN\1063 International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, Hungary 2) IN/788 Federation of Associations of Hunting and Conservation of Wildlife of the European Union, Belgium	25975

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
West Europe	25	Sharkproject Austria		Austria	www.sharkproject.org/category/austria	NG	1) NG/25149 Wildlands Conservation Trust, South Africa 2) NG/25217 Preserve Planet, Costa Rica	25924
	26	Fondazione UNA (UNA Foundation)	UNA	Italy	www.fondazioneuna.org	NG	1) NG/1036 Federparchi, Italy 2) GA/22714 National Park of Cilento, Vallo Di Diano and Alburni, Italy	Una
	27	Gallifrey Foundation		Switzerland	www.gallifrey.foundation	NG	1) IN/25930 SHARKPROJECT International e.V., Germany 2) NG/25638 SYLVIA EARLE ALLIANCE (DBA MISSION BLUE), USA 3) IN/25358 WWF International, Switzerland	Gallifrey Addl info.pdf
	28	Blue Marine Foundation	BLUE	United Kingdom	www.bluemarinefoundation.com	NG	1) NG/226 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, UK 2) NG/25002 The Pew Charitable Trusts, USA	25964

3 Membership applications rejected by GCC

North America and the Caribbean	1	New Mexico BioPark Society	NMBPS	United States of America	https://bioparksociety.org/main	NG	1) NG/25602 Honolulu Zoo USA 2) NG/170 Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), USA	NMBPS_incl_DDP_addlinfo
	2	S.P.E.C.I.E.S. The Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their International Ecological Study	S.P.E.C.I.E.S	United States of America	https://carnivores.org	NG	1) NG/25609 National Whistleblower Center, USA 2) NG/25779 Thinking Animals United, USA	SPECIES- incl DDP
West Europe	3	European Sustainable Use Group	ESUG	Belgium	http://esug.sycl.net	NG	1) IN/1416 International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey, Belgium 2) Hilde Eggermont, IUCN Councillor	ESUG

DECISION OF THE GOVERNANCE AND CONSTITUENCY COMMITTEE

The Governance and Constituency Committee,

Having reviewed

33 membership applications, which had been filed by 31 December 2019 and received no objections from the IUCN membership by email correspondence between 6 May and 4 June 2020 and at its meetings on 4 June¹ and 8 July 2020², and

one membership application from the UNA Foundation, Italy, which was deferred by the Bureau of IUCN Council, in February 2020, by e-mail correspondence and at its meeting of 8 July 2020,

1. Recommends to the Bureau of the IUCN Council to approve the admission of 28 organizations and/or institutions applying for IUCN membership in accordance with Regulation 18. (Appendix 1)

2. Recommends to the Bureau of the IUCN Council to reject the following applications for IUCN membership:

European Sustainable Use Group, Belgium based on the fact that the organisation in its public documents and statutes falsely represents itself as a part of IUCN;

New Mexico BioPark Society, USA, based on the fact that this is not a conservation organization but a procurement organization; and

S.P.E.C.I.E.S. The Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their International Ecological Study, USA, based on the fact that they are not a legal entity.

3. Defers its consideration of the applications from the

- **Center for Environmental Ethics and Law, USA**,
- **Center for Biological Diversity, USA**,
- **Beijing Sunny Green Environmental Protection Foundation, China** and
- **Institute of Constructions and Urban Economics, Viet Nam**,

to its next meeting.

¹ The minutes of the meeting of the GCC of 4 June 2020 are attached hereafter as Appendix 2.

² The minutes of the meeting of the GCC of 8 July 2020 are attached hereafter as Appendix 3.

28 Membership applications approved by GCC

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
Africa	1	Plateforme Nationale des Organisations Agro-Sylvo-pastorales et halieutiques du Cameroun (National Platform of Agro-sylvopastoral and fisheries Professional organisations of Cameroun)	PLANOPAC	Cameroun	www.planopac.cm	NG	1) NG/24960 CIPRE, Cameroun 2) NG/25723 Green Connexion, Cameroun	25910
	2	Association Marocaine pour le Développement des Aires Protégées (Moroccan Association for the Development of Protected Areas)	AMDAP	Morocco		NG	1) NG/1163 Association Marocaine pour la Protection de l'Environnement et le Climat, Morocco (Moroccan Association for Environment and Climate Protection) 2) NG/25846 Groupe de Recherche pour la Protection des Oiseaux au Maroc, Morocco (Moroccan Association for Environment and Climate Protection)	AMDAP_inclDDP
Meso and South America	3	Fundación Salvadoreña para la Promoción Social y el Desarrollo Económico (Salvadoran Foundation for Social Promotion and Economic Development)	FUNSALPRO DENSE	El Salvador	www.funsalprodese.org.sv	NG	1) NG/24645, Unidad Ecológica Salvadoreña, Honduras (Salvadorean Ecological Unit) 2) NG/24904 Comité para la Defensa y Desarrollo de la Flora y Fauna del Golfo de Fonseca, Honduras (Committee for the Defense and Development of the Flora and Fauna of the Gulf of Fonseca)	25967
	4	Proyecto Aldea Global (Global Village Project)	PAG	Honduras	www.paghonduras.org	NG	1) IP/24707 Agencia para el Desarrollo de la Mosquitia, Honduras (Agency for the Development of the Honduran Mosquitia) 2) NG/25741 Asociación para el Manejo Integrado de Cuencas de La Paz y Comayagua, Honduras (Association for the Integrated Management of the La Paz and Comayagua Watersheds)	PAG_inclDDP

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
Meso and South America	5	Fundación Nicaragüense para la Conservación- Fundación COCIBOLCA (COCIBOLCA Foundation)	FC	Nicaragua		NG	1) NG/24280 Fundación Reserva Esperanza Verde, Nicaragua 2) NG/24694 Asociación Club de Jóvenes Ambientalistas, Nicaragua (Youth Environmentalists Club)	25968
North America & the Caribbean	6	Canopy Planet Society		Canada	https://canopyplanet.org	NG	1) NG/194 The Nature Conservancy, USA 2) NG/25746 Synchronicity Earth, UK	CANOPY incl DDP
	7	The Wildlife Society	(TWS)	United States of America	www.wildlife.org	NG	1) NG/25729 Wild Sheep Foundation, USA 2) AF/192 National Wildlife Federation, USA	TWS incl DDP
	8	Center for Global Wildlife Conservation from the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry	CGWC	United States of America	www.esf.edu	NG	1) NG/25554 Cornell Botanic Garden, USA 2) NG/25616 Safari Club International Foundation, USA	CGWC inc DDP
	9	Conservation X Labs, Inc.	CXL	United States of America	www.conservationxlabs.org	NG	1) NG/279 Smithsonian Institution, USA 2) NG/25779 Thinking Animals United, Inc., USA	CXL incl DDP
	10	Revive & Restore		United States of America	www.reviverestore.org	NG	1) NG/25746 Synchronicity Earth, UK 2) IN/25310 Island Conservation, USA	RR inclDDP

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
South and East Asia	11	FRIENDSHIP		Bangladesh	www.friendship.ngo	NG	1) NG/25682 Jiban Bikash Karjocrom, Bangladesh 2) NG/ 22337 Center for Natural Resources Studies, Bangladesh	25991
	12	Cloud Mountain Conservation		China	www.cloudmountain.cn	NG	1) NG/25182 Shan Shui Conservation Center, China 2) NG/25765 Yunnan Green Environment Development Foundation, China	25966 Addlinfo
	13	China Environmental Protection Foundation	CEPF	China	http://www.cepf.org.cn/cepf_english/	NG	1) NG/25373 Society of Entrepreneurs & Ecology, China 2) NG/25044 All-China Environment Foundation, China	CEPF Addl info
	14	Green Pine Care Foundation	GPF	China		NG	1) NG/25611 Guangzhou Green City Environmental and Cultural Development Center, China 2) NG/25615 Shenzhen Mangrove Wetlands Conservation Foundation, China	25981
	15	India Water Foundation	IWF	India	www.indiawaterfoundation.org	NG	1) NG/25518 COORG Wildlife Society, India 2) NG/25370 Association for Rural Area Society Modification, Improvement and Nestling, India	25983
	16	Pakistan Rural Initiatives for Emergency Preparedness, Response and Development	PREPARED	Pakistan	www.preparedpakistan.org	NG	1) NG/25340 Human Resource Development Network, Pakistan 2) NG/25352 Institute of Rural Management, Pakistan	25989
	17	Foundation of Environmental Education for Sustainable Development (Thailand)	FEED	Thailand		NG	1) ST/161 Department od National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation, Thailand 2) NG/24714 Thailand Environmental Institute Foundation, Thailand	25965

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
West Asia	18	Centre for Restoration of the Iraqi Marshlands and Wetlands	CRIMW	Iraq	https://crim.mowr.gov.iq	GA	n/a	25919
	19	Nature Iraq Organization	NI	Iraq	www.natureiraq.org	NG	1) IN/213 BirdLife Intl, UK 2) NG/24611 World Land Trust, UK	25920
	20	Jordan BirdWatch Association	JBW	Jordan	www.jordanbirdwatch.com	NG	1) NG/25198 Royal Botanic Garden, Jordan 2) NG/25469 The Environmental Education Center of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land, Palestine	JBW_incl DDP
Oceania	21	The Colong Foundation for Wilderness	CFW	Australia	www.colongwilderness.org.au	NG	1) NG/270 Autralian Conservation Foundation, Australia 2) NG/518 Nature Conservation Council	CFW_incl DDP
East Europe, North and Central Asia	22	Udruga Dinarica (Dinarica Association)		Bosnia and Herzegovina		NG	1) NG/409 WWF, Switzerland 2) NG/487 WWF, The Netherlands	25929
	23	The Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus	RECC	Georgia	www.rec-caucasus.org	NG	1) NG/25062 Field researchers` Union - CAMPESTER, Georgia 2) ST/25100 Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	25923
	24	Lovacki savez Srbije (Hunting Association of Serbia)	LSS	Serbia	http://www.lss.rs/	NG	1) IN\1063 International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, Hungary 2) IN/788 Federation of Associations of Hunting and Conservation of Wildlife of the European Union, Belgium	25975

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
West Europe	25	Sharkproject Austria		Austria	www.sharkproject.org/category/austria	NG	1) NG/25149 Wildlands Conservation Trust, South Africa 2) NG/25217 Preserve Planet, Costa Rica	25924
	26	Fondazione UNA (UNA Foundation)	UNA	Italy	www.fondazioneuna.org	NG	1) NG/1036 Federparchi, Italy 2) GA/22714 National Park of Cilento, Vallo Di Diano and Alburni, Italy	Una
	27	Gallifrey Foundation		Switzerland	www.gallifrey.foundation	NG	1) IN/25930 SHARKPROJECT International e.V., Germany 2) NG/25638 SYLVIA EARLE ALLIANCE (DBA MISSION BLUE), USA 3) IN/25358 WWF International, Switzerland	Gallifrey Addl info.pdf
	28	Blue Marine Foundation	BLUE	United Kingdom	www.bluemarinefoundation.com	NG	1) NG/226 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, UK 2) NG/25002 The Pew Charitable Trusts, USA	25964

3 Membership applications rejected by GCC

North America and the Caribbean	1	New Mexico BioPark Society	NMBPS	United States of America	https://bioparksociety.org/main	NG	1) NG/25602 Honolulu Zoo USA 2) NG/170 Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), USA	NMBPS_incl_DDP_addlinfo
	2	S.P.E.C.I.E.S. The Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their International Ecological Study	S.P.E.C.I.E.S	United States of America	https://carnivores.org	NG	1) NG/25609 National Whistleblower Center, USA 2) NG/25779 Thinking Animals United, USA	SPECIES- incl DDP
West Europe	3	European Sustainable Use Group	ESUG	Belgium	http://esug.sycl.net	NG	1) IN/1416 International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey, Belgium 2) Hilde Eggermont, IUCN Councillor	ESUG

IUCN Statutory region	#	Organisation name	Acronym	IUCN Statutory State	Website	Member Category	Letters of endorsement from IUCN Members, National/Regional Committees, Councillors, Honorary Members	Detailed application
-----------------------	---	-------------------	---------	----------------------	---------	-----------------	---	----------------------

4 Membership applications deferred (or not discussed) by GCC at its 27th and 29th meetings

North America & the Caribbean	1	Center for Environmental Ethics and Law (decision to be made at next meeting of GCC)	CEEL	United States of America	www.environmentalethicsandlaw.org	NG	1) NG/1103 Australian Rainforest Conservation Society, Australia 2) NG/621 Ecological Society of the Philippines, Philippines 3) NG/1061 Fundacion Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, Argentina 4) NG/1075 George Wright Society, USA 5) NG/454 The Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature, Jordan 6) National Committee of IUCN Members, France	CEEL
	2	Center for Biological Diversity (decision to be made at next meeting of GCC)	CBD	United States of America	www.biologicaldiversity.org	NG	1) NG/515 Natural Resources Defense Council, USA 2) IN/25534 Born Free Foundation, UK 3) NG/25508 Center for Conservation Biology, USA	CBD application incl. objections & feedback received during application process Response to objections and additional feedback from DDP
South and East Asia	3	Beijing Sunny Green Environmental Protection Foundation (deferred - pending information from applicant - decision to be made at next meeting of GCC)	BSGEFP	China	www.bjlsyg.org.cn	NG	1) NG/25377 Chengdu Bird Watching Society, China 2) NG/25487 China Mangrove Conservation Network, China	25982
	4	Institute of Constructions and Urban Economics (deferred - pending information from applicant - decision to be made at next meeting of GCC)	(ICUE)	Viet Nam		NG	1) NG/25381 Center for environment and Community Research, Viet Nam 2) NG/25697 Centre of Live and Learn for Environment and Community, Viet Nam	25990

Annex 2 - Minutes of the GCC Meeting – 4 June 2020

Present: Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere (Chair), Tamar Pataridze (Deputy Chair), Jenny Gruenberger, Hilde Eggermont (proxy for Lider Sucre for half the meeting. She then had to leave and both Hilde's and Lider's proxy were passed to Tamar Pataridze), Sixto Inchaustegui, Mamadou Diallo, Ramiro Batzín (not connected for full meeting).

Apologies: Masahiko Horie, Lider Sucre (proxy given to Hilde Eggermont), Shaikha Salem Al Dhaheri

Absent: Ali Kaka, Youngbae Suh

Secretariat: Enrique Lahmann, Sandrine Friedli Cela, Luc De Wever (for the Gender Strategy item), Sarah Over, Fleurange Gilmour-Bieri, Anja Miller, Louise Imbsen, Jackie Siles (Governance and Rights Programme)

Agenda

1. Gender Strategy
2. Membership applications
3. Any other business

1. Gender Strategy

The Deputy Chair provided an update of progress made by the Gender Task Force.

During the 25th meeting of the GCC in February 2020, the Gender TF was asked to report to GCC in May. Since then, the Chair explained that following a Bureau decision, it was likely that the Council would ask the GCC to continue its governance work, including the Gender Strategy.

Tamar presented the work achieved by the TF to date, thanking the Governance and Rights programme for their support. Work undertaken included a survey that had been sent out to a sample group of people. Unfortunately, the response rate has been low.

The next steps of the TF will be to analyse the results of the survey and to have a progress report by 27 July. Based on the report and the findings, the draft action plan will be developed and included in the report.

Discussion centred on the poor response rate and solutions, which included some suggested amendments to a number of questions in the survey. Regarding an extension to the deadline for survey responses, the TF was reluctant to extend the process too long. Tamar suggested that the issues raised about the questions be addressed and to extend the deadline to 11 June. The GCC chair was asked to send reminders to those who had not completed the survey.

2. Membership applications

35 applications were ready to be considered during this meeting.

The Chair asked that in order to ensure that there is broad agreement on applications by the members of GCC, moving forward, 10 GCC Members (the current requirement is five) should review each application.

11 applications had been unanimously approved by e-mail correspondence:

- Association Marocaine pour le Développement des Aires Protégées (Moroccan Association for the Development of Protected Areas)
- Fundación Nicaragüense para la Conservación-Fundación COCIBOLCA
- Canopy Planet Society
- The Wildlife Society
- Cloud Mountain Conservation
- China Environmental Protection Foundation
- Nature Iraq Organization
- Jordan BirdWatch Association
- The Colong Foundation for Wilderness
- Udruga Dinarica (Dinarica Association)
- The Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus

There was also unanimity on approving application Sharkproject Austria, pending clarification (at the request of the Chair) on where the organization is registered given that its project work appears to be in Australia. The Secretariat agreed to check.

Global Village Honduras

Masahiko raised a question about the date of establishment of the foundation. This was confirmed to be 1986.

The Secretariat confirmed that they always verify that organization have been in existence for three years before circulating the applications to Members.

In discussion on the environmental record of applicants, Jenny noted that sometimes organizations have been in existence for a long time but that they have only recently been involved as conservation. This should be taken into account when considering applications.

Tamar was concerned that the organisation's vision and mission is not directly linked to IUCN. The Chair noted that in reading the organisation's website and seeing the description of the conservation work they undertake, the different conservation-related fields they work in and how they described the organisation she was satisfied that they did share the objectives of IUCN. She felt that the vision and missions of organisations are not always clear but when she looked at the objectives, she found that there were social and other issues that were specifically mentioned and she was satisfied that they shared the objectives relating to environmental concerns.

GCC Decision - Admit.

FRIENDSHIP

Concerns were raised about the relationship of the organisation with IUCN and from Jenny on the lack of clarity about what work on conservation the organisation has and does undertake.

Regarding the timeframe of conservation work, it was noted that the application form asks applicants to describe their main achievements in the last three years. The reason this question is asked is to help clarify that the organisation does comply with Article 7(c) of

having a substantial record of activity in the conservation on nature. The three years is based on the requirement in Regulation 5 (a) that the organisation must have been in existence for at least three years.

The question was raised whether or not clarification was needed with regards to this to avoid difficult situations. Enrique noted that the Regulations require an organisation to have been in existence for 3 years, not for it to be carrying out environmental work for three years. The Chair noted that while the Statutes do not specify the length of time an organisation has been active in conservation it requires the GCC should actively consider whether an organization has a substantial conservation record. She advised the GCC to remain flexible and not fix it to three years, noting that the key would be the overall assessment being made by the GCC at the time an application is considered. The Legal Advisor agreed that the "substantial conservation record" should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The GCC decided that the information provided was not clear and the Secretariat was asked to contact the organisation and ask more specifically to name the year they began to work on conservation and the activities they have undertaken.

The question was raised regarding whether an additional question should be added to the membership application forms to account for the work of organisations who move into conservation after their formation. Wording along the following was proposed: "If your work in environment dates from after your formation, please clarify the projects you have been involved in and in which year the work took place". This question can be included with the sustainable use questions on the form.

GCC Decision: Defer. Secretariat to contact the organisation for more information on their track record.

Pakistan Rural Initiatives for Emergency Preparedness, Response and Development

Lider recognised that there was a nature focus in the work of this organisation, but felt that this was not clearly presented.

Tamar raised concerns about the lack of a conservation record of the organisation. The Chair agreed, noting that their record is not clear from the list of their activities since there are not any real conservation achievements listed. Nevertheless, she proposed the organisation be approved based on the concrete examples of the work they had done, on land and soil management, watershed, water conservation ponds – which are all very important areas of conservation. IUCN and its Commissions have worked on conflicts, disaster preparedness and environment in that context. The description of the organisation mentions water, food security and livelihoods, and the Chair confirmed that she was satisfied with their track record.

The Chair also commented that the form had not been filled in very well but that the additional questions had helped to clarify.

GCC Decision: Admit

UNA foundation

The organisation, which has been active for some time, received an objection regarding the source of some of their funding.

The Chair noted that the GCC does not normally look into the sources of funding for organisations and felt that the organisation should be approved.

Sixto agrees and there were no other objections from the GCC.

GCC Decision: Admit

CEEL

The Chair reminded the GCC that Secretariat had raised concerns about the relationship of this organisation with WCEL. The WCEL Chair confirmed that they are a separate organisation and recommended their admission as an IUCN Member.

The Chair raised her concerns about the track record of the organisation's work and said that they needed to distinguish the activities they have undertaken in their capacity as an organisation clearly from those they have undertaken when they were part of WCEL.

Hilde did not see anything problematic and felt that there were no conflicts with the objectives. The Chair agreed but was still concerned with the fact that from 2016, it was not clear what their activities had been. They list a webinar series, speaking at meetings, and publication of papers but there is no clarity.

GCC decided that it would be necessary for CEEL to clarify its record since it has become an organisation and asked the Secretariat to follow up.

GCC Decision: Defer pending clarification of record of conservation activities.

ESUG

The Chair reminded the GCC that following the last meeting, it was agreed to communicate with the organisation explaining the concern that they present themselves as if they are part of IUCN. Whilst nobody has any problems with their mission or objectives, they were asked to not present themselves as if they are a part of IUCN and to correct inaccurate or false representations, including to their website.

Having reviewed the website recently, the Chair commented that her view is that they continue to present themselves as part of IUCN. She was not convinced that they had done what they had been asked to do. The Chair opened the application for discussion:

Hilde and Sixto said that the ESUG had done enough to address the GCC concerns

Jenny expressed concerns that there was an ethical issue, as ESUG appeared to be holding themselves out to be a part of the IUCN, which they are not. Both Jenny and Ramiro expressed the concern that they could be seen to be an impostor.

The Legal Adviser explained that there was still inaccurate representation of ESUG as a part of IUCN in some of the pages of the organisation's website, and in particular the [IUCN-SUME](#). It was also noted that the founding statutes of ESUG also gave the impression that ESUG was part of IUCN.

The Chair noted that the misrepresentation about their being part of IUCN needs to be addressed across everything they do, and not just about the website. Jenny and Ramiro

reiterated their concern about the ethical issues relating to the misrepresentation of the organisation and felt that until this had been addressed, the organisation should not be admitted to IUCN. The Chair acknowledged and agreed with Jenny's concerns.

After extended discussion, the GCC considered whether to reject, accept, or defer the decision. The Chair summarized discussion in the GCC noting that the issue goes deeper than just the website and that the GCC was concerned that they did not present themselves as an independent organization. The ESUG would need to discuss this issue and demonstrate that they have moved from their history, as a working group of IUCN.

Hilde, who had provided a recommendation to admit this member, stated she would feel uncomfortable to reject the ESUG and proposed that the GCC reach out to them again to ask them to make things clear, providing them with some specific examples of where things could be improved. It may not be possible for them to see how they can address GCC requests in a satisfactory way and GCC should guide them to make the changes.

Ramiro confirmed that he felt that the organisation needed to clarify who they are and proposed they be rejected.

The Legal Adviser mentioned that in their own statutes the EUSG refer to IUCN in different places, in the historical background of their establishment, which is fine. She noted that EUSG requires their members to subscribe to the IUCN objectives. If there were a recommendation to be made to them, she would ask them to see if their statutes could be adapted in the sense that is deemed appropriate because they are similar to what they say in the website, thus creating confusion. During the due diligence process, the SSC Commission had clarified that they did not consider EUSG as part as the Commission.

The issue of ethics was reconsidered and the seriousness of an organization holding itself to be part of IUCN. The Legal Adviser confirmed that if IUCN found someone using the IUCN logo and branding, they would write to them and ask them to rectify the way they are presenting themselves. She also noted that whilst the Secretariat has processes in place to deal with such cases, there is no dedicated team to do so, which gives rise to issues of capacity. However, IUCN has the right to protect its name and logo. It could go as far as going to court if it is very problematic.

The Chair proposed given the discussion and views of members that the GCC reject the application and write to them explaining that the GCC does not consider them to be part of IUCN and that their statutes and website still give that impression. They will be invited to reapply in three years' time when they have had time to reorganise themselves and demonstrated their independence. The Legal Adviser noted that asking this of the organisation in some way goes beyond what the GCC does and what the Secretariat does. It was agreed that the GCC should not depart from usual practice in its letter. It was agreed that the Secretariat would need to draft a letter and it would need to be reviewed by the Legal adviser

Mamadou felt that since the organisation had not done what had been asked of them and the fact that they are using the IUCN name and logo, something that they are not allowed to do, the GCC should reject their application.

Jenny reiterated her concerns regarding ethics.

Sixto supported rejection, noting in particular the comments of the Legal Adviser. Sixto noted that there would not be much additional information even if the Chairs of CEM were approached, so there was no point delaying any further and he moved to reject.

Hilde added that while she would accept the majority decision she would like the record to show that she had proposed the middle route of giving them the opportunity to make further changes.

The Chair asked for votes:

Jenny, Jennifer, Sixto, Mamadou voted to reject. Ramiro had voted to reject earlier (unfortunately, he was disconnected and did not participate in the last part of the discussion).

Hilde, Lider, Tamar voted to defer

GCC Decision: reject

GCC asked Secretariat to draft the rejection letter and send this to the GCC Chair prior to sending it to ESUG.

Next meeting

Outstanding Membership applications

Council decision asking GCC to continue governance work

Secretariat was requested to send a reminder for the 28th GCC meeting at the end of June and a new doodle for a 29th meeting the first week of July.

GCC meeting 8 July 2020

Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere, Chair
Tamar Pataridze, Deputy Chair
Hilde Eggermont (proxy for Masahiko Horie and Lider Sucre)
Sixto Inchaustegui
Jenny Gruenberger (proxy for Mamadou Diallo and Shaikha al Dhaheri)

Secretariat: Grethel Aguilar (Acting Director General), Boris Erg (Regional Director, ECARO), Sharon Fitzpatrick (Head of Oversight), Enrique Lahmann, Fleurange Bieri, Sarah Over, Anja Miller, Louise Imbsen

Agenda

- 1. Information on Serbia concerns**
- 2. Management response – Update on IUCN ethics, compliance, integrity framework**
- 3. Consideration of 20 Membership applications**

1. Information on Serbia Concerns

The Chair welcomed GCC members and the Acting Director General (ADG), Boris Erg and Sharon Fitzpatrick before moving to the first item on the Agenda and asked the ADG to provide the background to the issue

The ADG explained that Serbia has sent the Secretariat letters in relation to the adhesion of Kosovo as IUCN State Member. Kosovo became a Member on 6 March 2019, following the standard IUCN procedure of the State informing IUCN of its adhesion to the IUCN Statutes.

Serbia has voiced their displeasure about this, in particular the fact that there is a UN Security Council resolution stating that Kosovo is under the administration of the UN and is an integral part of Serbia. Serbia holds the opinion that IUCN has politicised this situation because it has not taken into account that resolution.

The Secretariat has explained to Serbia that the IUCN Statutes sets out the procedure for admitting members. Kosovo complies with the requirements set out in the Statutes, namely the fact that it is a member of two UN specialised agencies, the World Bank and IMF. Therefore, when Kosovo sent their letter of adhesion and paid its dues, it automatically became an IUCN State Member.

In the latest correspondence from Serbia insists that IUCN is not complying with international law regulations. However the opinion of Legal Advisor states that IUCN is compliant ([Legal Opinion available here](#)).

The Legal Adviser confirmed that Kosovo became a Member automatically in 2019 as per the Statutory requirements. In preparing her legal opinion, the Legal Adviser had analysed the question of whether IUCN should first check whether a state is a state in international law or not before recognising them as an IUCN Member. Should there be a two-step process? She concluded that this is not the intent of the Statutes. The aim was to depoliticise them in 1972 when they were written. Consequently, IUCN assumes that organisations like the World Bank and IMF have made the assessment. IUCN follows these

institutions decisions and recognised Kosovo as a State Member. For States, membership it is automatic. There is no Council decision on admission.

As far as the International Law question is concerned, the Legal Advisor explained that there had been a request for an advisory opinion to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) regarding Kosovo when they declared independence. The ICJ concluded that “the adoption of the declaration of independence did not violate international law, the Security Council resolution 1244 or the Constitutional Framework of the UNMIK”. It is up to each organisation or State to decide whether or not they want to recognise them as a State. For IUCN, the only relevant issue is Art 5 of the Statutes and the Legal Adviser concluded that this is sufficient to demonstrate that they have been recognised by two other agencies. For her, there is no further requirement. Regarding the process of adhesion, which is unilateral. Kosovo did validly become an IUCN Member in 2019 and the Union will continue to answer along these lines in the future

The ADG added that even though she feels comfortable how IUCN has handled the situation, it does not mean that it is not a sensitive one. Councillors chairing the Members' Assembly need to be aware of the situation so that any of them will be ready to respond accordingly. It is important that nobody thinks we are taking sides in a situation that is out of the control of IUCN. The confirmed the important of communication the issue to the Council or the GCC, especially now in the run up to Congress.

The Chair explained that she was concerned that given the divisions around Kosovo within the UN creates a risk that the issue will be brought up during the Congress. There are blocks of countries with positions on the Kosovo issue. She noted that it would be worthwhile for GCC to think about how Serbia might intervene. They have an objection to Kosovo's membership and there is concern at a higher level around the Statutes. These are all discussions that we need to be ready for so that we can respond in an effective way. If it comes to Members raising the issue of statutory reform it is important that Councillors are ready to respond to that. Thought must be given to what guidance would be from the podium.

There were no questions of clarification from GCC members.

Ali Kaka confirmed his agreement in general with the Chair and asked if there had been any responses from the rest of the IUCN membership regarding Kosovo's membership. He had no concerns about the membership since there had been none and as long as the adhesion process has been followed.

Boris explained that IUCN works in most of the region. The Regional Office has been based in Belgrade since 2004. This membership has not helped relations with Serbia as the admission of Kosovo is delicate and sensitive issue for the office. Unfortunately, this has developed into a fully political situation. Boris explained that in the discussions he was involved in, it was a clear case, despite the fact that they are not a UN member. The Security Council is deeply divided but Kosovo does fill the IUCN criteria. It was not an easy process but we followed the Statutes and since they comply, they were admitted. The situation is being managed in Serbia as best as possible but there is an intense agenda vis-à-vis Kosovo-Serbia relation discussions and there will be a number of discussions later this week.

Sharing the issue with Members will open questions but preparing for a possible discussion in Marseille would be a better way forward. He offered support to Council and HQ on this issue if needed.

The Chair noted that the critical issue is that the membership conforms with the Statutes but it does create a series of risks including politically for Council, it is important that Council stays abreast of the situation and that the GCC with the DGO continues to monitor the situation. In this way, as we approach Congress in January, we can identify what is needed in preparation for Congress.

The Chair noted that it was over 6 months before the issue was brought to the attention of the Council. In order to avoid a similar situation where there is poor communication around a state membership that could result in conflict politically for IUCN, the Chair and the DGO was of the view that we should adopt a recommendation to the DGO regarding how to deal with these situations. The recommendation is that the DGO regularly updates the Council on current sensitive State membership issues to ensure that any problems can be anticipated where possible. The Chair commended the ADG for her collaborative working relationship with Council.

Tamar and Sixto agreed with the recommendation, Jenny thanked the ADG and the LA for their work.

The GCC adopted the recommendation.

GCC will continue to work with the DGs office so that the GCC and Council may prepare adequately should this issue be raised. The ADG said it would be important that the new DG be informed of the issues so that he can ensure that the GCC is informed about the situation.

2. Management response to the External Review of IUCN's Governance – Update on IUCN ethics, compliance, integrity framework

Management Response Annex to Management Response

One of the issues addressed in the Management Response to the External Review of IUCN's Governance concerns the recommendation related to establishing a comprehensive integrity ethics and conduct system for IUCN. During the 28th meeting of the GCC held on 25 June 2020, the Secretariat had produced a [draft action plan](#), for discussion and the Chair requested input on this issue from the Head of Oversight to guide GCC and Council in understanding what the Secretariat system for integrity and ethics comprises.

Sharon made a presentation on her views of the system within the Secretariat. ([Presentation available here](#)). The information should be used in reference to the management response and decide on what the next steps would be.

Sharon explained that her approach was neutral and that she is not a compliance official. She brings the holistic overview from what she has seen in IUCN and that she is here to provide advisory services but is not the owner of the integrity programme. The oversight needs to remain independent. Assurance or advisory – she does not own it.

She pointed out that Council should have their own perspective and that it would be important that any recommendation should take into account both the corporate governance perspective and that of the Council, in terms of oversight of the IUCN ethical culture.

Discussion.

The Chair thanked Sharon noting that she had found it very interesting to hear how she had identified how an organisation could go about developing a culture of integrity. The Chair noted that what is striking in Sharon's thinking is that it is along the pillars of Council, Commissions, Secretariat and external advisory actors. However, the experience with WWF and Oxfam has shown that some of the ethical problems that international organisations encounter are falling across these sectors. They may involve relationship in terms of gender or race or other ethical issues between management and the governance body, they may involve harassment to programmatic staff or communities in which we work and there is a need to think beyond the pillar structure. She asked how IUCN might address these more complex ethical issues within Union within the framework that she had proposed.

Sharon explained that some of the lessons learned from Oxfam and WWF are that you can have the perfect code of conduct and still have a very bad environment. It all starts with culture stemming from tone from the top. Council needs to set the message that integrity and ethics conduct are important. That is what resonated from GCF meeting – the messaging comes from the top and the actions have to follow. It is not possible just say that it is the Conflict of Interest programme that is deficient. That is merely the mechanism - what matters is the culture. You need the framework to support the culture. IUCN has not mapped out what mechanism it has, or what the gaps are. It will be necessary to go back and have a look at the holistic integrity programme and looking at the gaps. To date, IUCN has plugged the gaps in an ad hoc way. It is not the most effective way. What you need is a framework behind it to ensure that it sticks. There are many things to consider. Map out what you do have, what the gaps are and then putting in the infrastructure that can support council and secretariat with its related bodies.

Jenny– suggested the establishment of a “Court of honour”. This could be a strong, independent body elected during Congress so that it is representative. It could be a body that does not work all the time but only when they are consulted on certain matters.

Sharon replied that in some organisations there are ethics officers, maybe at an internal, senior level, reporting directly to the DG. That is not something IUCN has invested in. You need your structure for the Secretariat and you need the same for Council because although they are interconnected they are different mechanisms. It would be possible to have an independent governance and ethics officer who could lead your integrity programme.

The Chair confirmed that there is a need to have a body that is independent of the different components of IUCN. Council has accepted the proposal that we do set up an independent ethics body.

The Chair asked how a system that is developed for the Secretariat – e.g. sexual harassment – could be used to address context across the different components of the Union, for e.g. by a member of staff of a Member or Council Member

Sharon explained that the GCF has a policy on sexual exploitation and harassment. Their framework is harmonised across all pillars. Currently, IUCN policy is under the ownership of the Secretariats Human Resources department. Oversight helped with the development of the policy which is geared towards IUCN staff. Commissions and Council are encouraged to follow the example. However, a framework could be designed holistically to cover all IUCN.

The Chair noted that the environmental movement was starting to take on board global concerns about racism in environmental organizations following the Black Lives Matter movement and that it would be important to what how this evolves so that IUCN keeps abreast of the issues in its Ethics and Independence Framework.

GCC will design the next steps for the current and the future Council

3. Consideration of 20 Membership applications

The Chair proposed to leave the discussion on CBD and the applications from the last meeting to the end of the current meeting in order to get through as many of the other applications as possible.

Planopac – Plateforme Nationale des Organisations Agro-Sylvo-pastorales et halieutiques du Cameroun.

The Chair had contacted the IUCN programme director, George Akwah in the PACO office. He said that he had spoken to the Cameroon office who confirmed that this organisation was a partner in a number of IUCN projects, was actively engaged in environment and he recommended that Planopac be admitted.

Jenny noted that Mamadou had rejected the application.

GCC Decision: Admit.

Funsalprodense – Fundación Salvaroeña para la Promoción Social y el Desarrollo Económico

The Chair raised the questions of whether the organisation needed to clarify their objectives in relation to conservation.

Hilde noted that she could see the conservation added value aspect, even if this was not clearly stated on their website. Since the site is only in Spanish it was hard to establish what their conservation objectives are. However, she felt that they should be admitted.

Other GCC members agreed.

GCC decision: Admit

Conservation X Labs, Inc

GCC members agreed that the organisation has clear conservation objectives and should be admitted.

GCC decision: Admit

CGWC – Centre for Global Wildlife Conservation from the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry

This application raised issues about organisations applying in categories that they don't fall into. The Chair noted that the GCC cannot tell organisations what category they should apply in - they can only advise them. She raised the question of whether such a decision

was motivated by the dues, and whether the GCC would like to ask them to apply as an affiliate.

Tamar said that for her, the organisation sees themselves as an NGO, and they meet the requirements for that category and should be admitted in that category.

The move to admit them was supported by the GCC.

GCC Decision: admit

New Mexico BioPark Society

The Chair was concerned by the fact that this organisation appears to be a procurement organisation.

Hilde noted that having seen the Chair's comments she agreed that organisation itself is not a conservation organisation but indeed a procurement organisation.

The GCC noted that organisation had received the support of the Regional and National Committees.

Tamar had supported the admission but having heard the concerns regarding procurement, she would support the rejection.

GCC members agreed.

GCC Decision: Reject

Revive and Restore

The Chair was unsure about this application in view of the field it operates in. Council is still considering the proposal of synthetic biology and noted the comment from John Robinson that at two years old, they don't have a conservation track record.

Ali felt that their technology does add value to conservation. He noted that Kenya is using this innovative technology in the conservation of the white rhino, for example.

Tamar said that in Europe, Members are in general agreement about the value of the technology and Enrique pointed out that the IUCN Member Island Conservation (who supported the application) operates in the same field.

The Chair asked which members would support admission: Tamar, Hilde, Ali and Sixto supported.

Jenny and Jennifer felt that as long as there is no IUCN policy on the technology she would vote to reject.

GCC Decision: admit

SPECIES – The Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their international Ecological Study

Following concerns about the legal status of the SPECIES, Secretariat had consulted with the Office of the Legal Adviser (OLA). The OLA advised that SPECIES should not be applying because they are not a legal entity. They form a part of Lifescape, who is the entity who should be applying. On this basis, GCC rejected the application.

The GCC confirmed that replies to objections to applications can be shared with objectors once the decision-making process has been finalised.

The GCC also considered that the advice they should give the organisation would be that they would be able to reapply in three years' time once they have become a legal entity.

GCC Decision: Reject.

Beijing Sunny Green Environmental Protection Foundation

The GCC Chair voiced her concern over whether or not this organisation is a conservation organisation. She could not see that their activities are conservation activities.

Tamar commented that one of the issues facing GCC members in this review is that there is nothing on the internet in English.

However, in order to undertake a proper review of the application, GCC requested the Secretariat to contact the organisation, asking them for more information on their conservation record.

GCC Decision: Defer

Green Pine Care Foundation

Lider had raised concerns about the organisation's funding agency status.

GCC members raised concerns about the organisation's funding agency status and felt that clarification was needed and deferral for more information was proposed.

The GCC discussed whether or not an organisation that only provides funding should be accepted as an IUCN Member. The Chair highlighted the fact that the organisation undertook a number of other activities that support conservation and proposed to admit them. This was supported by a majority.

GCC decision: Admit

Indian Water Foundation

Hilde noted that she felt the link to conservation/biodiversity was indirect but would be happy to support the majority decision on this application.

The Chair felt that their activities were clearly conservation based and noted that the organisation has submitted an activity report to the Secretariat.

Ali highlighted the fact that although the organisation does not have very strong conservation activities as such, there was an indirect approach, which does have a long-term impact on the environment. Further, they could benefit from IUCN membership and learn more about what we mean by conservation.

Tamar echoed these thoughts and confirmed she thought that this is an interesting organisation and although there is not a strong link to conservation, there is still one there.

GCC Decision: Admit

Foundation for Environmental Education for Sustainable Development (Thailand)

GCC members were happy that this organisation fulfilled the requirements to become a Member.

GCC Decision: Admit

Institute of Construction and Urban Economics

Jenny confirmed that concerns she had previously had been clarified by the additional information provided.

The Chair raised her concern about the fact that the organisation appeared to be a consultancy firm. She thought that although they had provided additional information on their work, it was unclear if it is the Ministry or the organisation that implements the work. GCC requested Secretariat to contact the organisation requesting clarification.

GCC Decision: Defer

Centre for Restoration of the Iraqi Marshlands and Wetlands

Sixto had not been able to access the website of the organisation but following the discussion that took place, he was satisfied that the organisation be admitted.

The Chair moved to approve which was supported.

GCC Decision: admit

Hunting association Serbia – Lovacki savez Srbije

Tamar had asked for more information on the organisation following her review of the documentation. The Regional Office confirmed that they had not had any contact with them. She felt that more insight on the organisation to have some additional personal insight on them would be interesting but would support the approval of the application.

Jenny abstained from the vote (Note: since she held the proxy votes of Shaikha, and Mamadou they also counted as abstentions.

A majority supported the admission since the organisation does have conservation objectives. Further, it was noted that they are involved in the restoration of degraded agriculture lands and in breeding of declining species.

GCC Decision – admit

Sharkproject – Austria

Having confirmed that this organisation was applying in the right region, the GCC voted to admit them

GCC Decision: admit

Gallifrey Foundation

In reviewing the application, Ali, and the Chair had proposed the application be deferred. The Chair proposed that all funding organisation applications be put on hold for the time being to allow the Council to have a serious discussion about the issue of admitting foundations as IUCN Members.

Ali also pointed out that the applicants had not set out a clear statement on their position on sustainable use and that they should be clearer with their opinion.

The Chair recognised that funding organisations have been accepted as IUCN Members in the past. However, she felt that the Union's reading of these organisations' contribution to conservation is becoming increasingly wider. She asked whether this issue should be more widely discussed in GCC with a view to asking for guidance from Council.

Enrique explained the reasoning behind the change to the Statutes some years ago was to widen the scope of the membership by allowing the consideration, and inclusion of organisations whose aim is to assist conservation.

The Chair agreed but felt that Council should reflect on what assisting society should mean. In recent years, this has included education, media (running film festivals) and more. However, it is important from time to time for GCC and Council to reflect on their practices and to reflect on the criteria used to accept Members and how that contributes to the vision and mission of IUCN:

She suggested that the GCC should have a considered opinion either way. She proposed the Committee review existing policy and practice and interpretation and asked for comments.

Jenny agreed that it would be important to have the discussion but she felt that since many such organisations have been accepted to date, it would be difficult to stop doing so at this point. Rather we should continue to accept them and undertake a review within GCC/Council.

Hilde agreed with the Chair that it is important to reflect from time to time whether it is the right decision. Whilst she could see the added value of having the discussion, she felt that rejecting this application before such a discussion took place would put GCC in a difficult position. Such a decision would not be justified.

The Chair recommended the discussion be added to the agenda of the GCC. The last changes were made in 2012. She reflected on how often the Committee should have such discussions, and concluded that Committee should not be afraid of suggesting change. The discussion should take into account historic documentation. Until then, the existing practice would continue. On the application in question, she felt that the organisation had not addressed the question on sustainable use adequately and proposed to defer the discussion. Ali agreed and noted the need to have a clear agreement of what sustainable use is and also what is IUCN's work around sustainable use. It is important that there be a level education among GCC Members.

GCC Decision: Admit

Blue Marine Foundation

Masahiko had asked for more information on the organisations sustainable use policy. He had also raised a more general concern about the responses of many organisations to the sustainable use policy on the application form. The Chair acknowledged the concern but she was satisfied with the further information that had been supplied by the organisation.

GCC Decision: Admit.

CEEL – Center for Environmental Ethics and Law

This application was deferred from the previous meeting pending more detailed information on the organisation's conservation activities. In the application, the activities listed appeared to be for WCEL. The GCC had asked them to distinguish those that they do for their own rather than as for WCEL.

The organisation confirmed that they do all their work in their own capacity. Ali felt that still more information and clarification is needed.

The GCC were surprised at the tone of the responses and in particular, the comments about the length of time the process had taken so far. They felt that the comments were unjustified. Secretariat explained that there are some indications of timings on the IUCN website and suggested they remove these to avoid confusion in the future.

Sixto noted that judging by their latest response, it was unlikely that the organisation would be willing to submit any more information.

As there was insufficient time to discuss the details of the responses, the application was deferred.

GCC decision: Deferral.

Friendship

Following the deferral from the last meeting, the organisation had supplied further information. Due to insufficient time for discussion, the GCC Chair proposed that Secretariat circulate the information to the GCC members, who would consider and vote by email.

Following email review, GCC Decision: Admit

Comments on membership applications received from Councillors/Bureau members prior to the 88th Bureau meeting on 9 September 2020

(status: 21:30 CEST on 8 September 2020)

1. Membership application from [S.P.E.C.I.E.S. The Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their International Ecological Study, USA](#)

- Jon Paul Rodriguez:

“..the rejection of SPECIES (Society for the Preservation of Endangered Carnivores and their International Ecological Study), is due to the fact that they are not a legal entity. Both of these organizations are based in the USA, and are very actively involved in species conservation and capacity building.

In the case of SPECIES, the problem is that they are the research arm of a larger organization, [LifeScape International](#), and the application should have come from LifeScape instead of SPECIES. I agree with that. My objection to simply rejecting them and recommending that “they ... reapply in three years’ time once they have become a legal entity” is that LifeScape is already a legal entity registered as 501c3 NGO in the United States. I believe that IUCN’s recommendation should be to encourage LifeScape to apply for membership (instead of SPECIES), which does not require any delay.”

- Said Damhoureyeh: “...encourage LifeScape to apply instead of SPECIES”.
- Ana Tira: “I am happy with your (Jon Paul) suggestion for Species”.

- Jon Robinson:

“Thank you for forwarding the recommendations on admissions and rejections for IUCN Membership. As a Councillor, I have been most active in reviewing applications from prospective Members in my region. Two of the applications for Membership from the region are recommended for rejection, and I believe in both cases, the problem lies with confusion as to the nature of the organizations. Following extensive consultation with the Membership Committee of the U.S. National Committee, I believe that in both cases, the organizations are actively involved in species conservation and capacity building, and the applications should be approved, and thus cannot vote for approval of the present Bureau draft decision.

In the case of S.P.E.C.I.E.S., the recommendation for rejection was based on the fact that they are not a legal entity. S.P.E.C.I.E.S. is the conservation and research branch of LifeScape International, a legal 501(c)3, in the United States. An analogy is that Wildlife Conservation International, whose name changed to the Wildlife Conservation Society, was a branch of the New York Zoological Society, which was the legal 501(c)3 entity. Such multiple names are common in the United States. In my opinion, the application should have been submitted under the name LifeScape International, but S.P.E.C.I.E.S is an appropriate IUCN Member. My recommendation is that the application be modified to reflect the appropriate legal entity, and be approved”.

- Rick Bates:

“I agree with the recommendations from Bureau, though, based on the input from the Membership Committee of the US National Committee provided by John Robinson

on S.P.E.C.I.E.S. that the if the appropriate organizational name can be applied in time for our meeting that it also be approved.”

- Sixto Inchaustegui:

“After reading clarifications both from Jon Paul and John Robinson, I do agree that if the appropriate organization name for S.P.E.C.I.E.S. CAN can be applied in time for our meeting, the organization be admitted.”

2. Membership application from [New Mexico BioPark Society, USA](#)

- Jon Paul Rodriguez:

“... The rejection of New Mexico BioPark Society, is based on the perception that this is not a conservation organization but a procurement organization. Both of these organizations are based in the USA, and are very actively involved in species conservation and capacity building.

In the case of New Mexico BioPark Society (ABQ), I am deeply surprised by the recommendation to reject. In fact, I always use ABQ as an example of what an ideal IUCN member should aim to be. SSC has worked closely with ABQ for several years. They are partners of the SSC Chair's Office and have built a relationship with IUCN, that currently includes three full-time staff completely devoted to supporting Specialist Groups and the Secretariat on assessments for the Red List, planning species conservation, and implementing action plans. Jointly with the IUCN Red List Unit, we are grooming one of their staff to be one of two global trainers for trainers for the Red List (yes, the entire IUCN has only one trainer of trainers for Red List assessment, as incredible as this may seem). In addition to this, ABQ recently joined the IUCN Partnership, a consortium of organizations that govern the IUCN Red List, through an agreement signed by ABQ and the IUCN Director General on behalf of the Partnership. ABQ also works on recovery plans of extinct in the wild species and uses Red List signage throughout its exhibits. They are deeply committed to the IUCN mission and vision, and want to formalize this link through IUCN membership. Their direct annual contribution to the work of IUCN is worth over US\$ 400,000, without counting their membership fees. The most important issue, however, is that ABQ has been working for years on developing a strong relationship with IUCN. Rejecting their membership would represent a severe blow to the partnership model that SSC has built in support of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and the network of 10,000 members of the Commission. All of the activities of ABQ on behalf of the objectives of IUCN clearly distinguish it from a procurement organization – this is a misinterpretation of what they do. I urge Bureau to admit ABQ to the Union.”

- Said Damhoureyeh: “I agree with Jon Paul's and move to admit ABQ..”.
- Ana Tira: “However, it is not clear to me on the New Mexico organisation. I will wait for more details from the GCC in response to yours (Jon Paul)”.

- Jon Robinson:

"Thank you for forwarding the recommendations on admissions and rejections for IUCN Membership. As a Councillor, I have been most active in reviewing applications from prospective Members in my region. Two of the applications for Membership from the region are recommended for rejection, and I believe in both cases, the problem lies with confusion as to the nature of the organizations. Following extensive consultation with the Membership Committee of the U.S. National Committee, I believe that in both cases, the organizations are actively involved in species conservation and capacity building, and the applications should be approved, and thus cannot vote for approval of the present Bureau draft decision.

In the case of New Mexico BioPark Society, the reason for the proposed rejection was that it was a procurement organization. I am not sure of the definition of a procurement organization, but I can assure my fellow Councillors that the organization has been active in conservation activities, and has a positive and supporting role with the Species Survival Commission, and has been a core supporter, both financially and through training and capacity building, of the Red List process. I have also read the detailed support letter from Jon Paul Rodriguez, Chair of the SSC, and find his arguments accord with my own understanding. My recommendation therefore is that the New Mexico BioPark Society be admitted as a IUCN Member."

- Rick Bates:

And based on input from both John and Jon Paul in regard to the New Mexico BioPark Society, that it be approved as well.

- Sixto Inchaustegui:

Also, with proper clarifications from Jon Paul, to admit New Mexico Bio Park Society.

Summary of the 88th Bureau meeting
9 September 2020

The Bureau concurred with the CPC's recommendation to postpone the 2020 Congress to a later date in 2021 to be mutually agreed with the Host Country, because it is clear that the 2020 Congress won't be able to convene successfully due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In order to ensure the institutional stability of the Union, the Bureau also accepted the CPC's recommendation to refer a number of decision items presently included in the draft Agenda of the 2020 Congress to an electronic vote of the IUCN Members to be held in the beginning of 2021.

The only specification recommended by the Bureau was to delegate to the Governance and Constituency Committee the decision which motions on IUCN governance (incl. statutory reform) will, following the online discussion, be ready for submission to the electronic vote and which ones will have to be referred to the (physical) Members' Assembly for discussion and vote because they are controversial or warrant continued debate at Congress.

The Bureau discussed which other matters could be referred to an electronic vote but concluded that this question should be dealt with directly by the Council on 14 September 2020.

While summing up the Bureau discussion, the President requested the Secretariat to study the process and the technical/financial aspects of holding the elections by electronic means prior to the Congress in case the Council would decide it, and he suggested that Council members consult the IUCN Members on their views whether the elections should be held during the Members' Assembly or by electronic vote.

The Bureau also discussed the following matters:

1. The issues raised by a number of Council members in respect of some of the membership applications recommended by GCC for admission or rejection. The live meeting of the Bureau was very helpful with facilitating a way forward for most of the issues. The Bureau decision on these specific issues (attached herewith) will be incorporated in the final decision of the Bureau on all membership applications transmitted to the Bureau on 5 September 2020 and submitted to Council for validation in accordance with our normal procedures.
2. The membership of the Council Working Group to design and guide engagement with IUCN members on the impacts of Covid-19 pandemic. The Bureau is grateful for the expressions of interest received from Council members as well as from the Global Group for the Development of National and Regional Committees. The Chairs of the three standing committees have kindly accepted the Bureau's request to facilitate a proposal for the Bureau's approval as soon as possible.
3. The Treasurer presented his reflections on IUCN's financial situation taking into account the possible scenarios for Congress.

More details on all agenda items will be provided in the minutes of the Bureau meeting which will be communicated when they are available.